

A  
DISCOURSE,

- I. Of the Unity of the Church.
- II. Of the Separation of the *Dissenters* from the *Church of England*.
- III. Of their setting up Churches against the Conforming Churches; and of the Ordination of their Teachers.

Being An  
ANSWER

To a BOOK, Entituled,

*Dissenters no Schismatics, &c.*

---

By ROBERT BURSCOUGH, M.A.  
Vicar of Totnes, and Arch-Deacon of  
*Barnstaple*.

---

EXETER: Printed by Sam. Farley, for  
Tho. Bennet at the Half Moon in St. Paul's-  
Church-yard, London, and Charles Tce Book-  
seller in Exon. M.DCC.IV.

# DISCOURSE

- I. Of the Unity of the Church.
- II. Of the Separation of the Church from the State of England.
- III. Of the Liberty of Conscience.



AN

Discourse by Schismatics, &c.

BY ROBERT BOSCOTTON, M.A.  
Vicar of Tisbury, and A.D. 1640.

LONDON:  
Printed by W. B. for J. W. at the Sign of the Sun in St. Dunstons Church-yard, 1640.  
Selling in a New Edition, 1700.



**TO THE**  
**Right Reverend**

**Father in GOD,**

**JONATHAN**

**Lord - Bishop**

**OF**  
**EXETER.**

**My Lord,**

**I** Cannot but take the First Opportunity of making Publick the Acknowledgments which I owe to Your Lordship, not only for the Favour which I lately receiv'd from You, but also for the

*The Epistle*

Manner of Conferring it on me ;  
which was so Free and Generous,  
so worthy of a Great and Noble  
Mind, that it affected me very  
sensibly : and it hath since made  
me often wish, for the sake of  
others, That the Example might  
every where prevail amongst Per-  
sons of Quality. For this would  
not only be an Ease and Benefit to  
such as they thought fit to oblige,  
but a Satisfaction to themselves,  
who would then find Double the  
Returns of Gratitude, when no  
part of it was intercepted by the  
way, when no Abatements were  
made for Intercession, none for  
Importunity.

I perswade my self, that it was  
my hearty Endeavour to do what  
Service I was able to the Church,  
that gave Your Lordship some  
Thoughts to my Advantage. And  
I can now go on more cheerfully  
with

### Dedicatory.

with my Work, and appear abroad with better Assurance, since I have the Honour to do what is Acceptable to a Prelate of so Clear a Judgment, and Great Penetration; who is both my Diocesan and Benefactor, and who is the Person upon Earth, to whom I have the most Reason, and the greatest Inclination, to approve my self.

IF I can do this, I shall little regard the Censure of Open Enemies, or of False Friends. Of those I mean, who, as Dr. Sutcliffe said of *Epist. D. d.* their Predecessors, are sorry that any <sup>before his</sup> *Answer to a* should stop the Breach against such <sup>certain Li-</sup> *bel Supplic.* as seek to enter into our Vineyard, to make a Spoil. Not but that they, Good Men! are for Conformity. But they would have the Cause shift for it self, it being Unreasonable, as they conceive, at present to be engaged in Controversies. But they should turn their Discourse ano-

A

ther

## The Epistle

ther way, and make their Application to those, who will not suffer us to be Quiet, but at the Expence of Truth; nor so much as allow us a Title to Moderation, unless we will be Idle Spectators of their Restless Attempts against our Constitution: In which they had lately such Hopes of Success, that one of them, who is said to be a *Learned and Holy Man*, de-

*Advice to the Churches of the Non-Conformists in the English Nation.* clar'd, That the Lord Jesus is not far from setting on us the Marks of his Displeasure; and exhorted his Brethren to be stedfast in their Nonconformity, for that the Day which will justify their Stedfastness is at hand,

THIS he said by way of Prophecy; and if Events had answer'd it, as I hope they never will, doubtless his Name would have been publish'd, and great Things would

*Dedicatory.*

would have been said of his Inspirations : But now we are to understand no more of him, but that he was a *Learned and Holy Man.*

THERE are very many of the Spirit of this Impostor, and and that carry on the same Work, but they do it not in the same manner. For as the Lord Chancellor *Bacon* says of a great number of Writings that came abroad against Queen Elizabeth, That  
“ some of them pretended the  
“ Gravity and Authority of Ec-  
“ clesiastical History, to move  
“ Belief : Some were form’d in-  
“ to Advertisements and Remon-  
“ strances of State, to move Re-  
“ gard : Some were represented  
“ as it were in Tragedies of Per-  
“ secution, to move Pity : And  
“ some were contriv’d into Plea-

*Observat. on  
a Libel prin-  
ted A. D.  
1592.*

### *The Epistle*

“*last Pasquils and Satyrs to  
“ move Sport. So may we say  
of the Books printed and disper-  
sed against the Church of Eng-  
land: They have appeared in all  
Shapes, as well as assaulted Her in  
all Her Rights.*”

**BUT** their Authors of late  
seem much to affect the Air of  
the Buffoon, and to trust more to  
their Scurrility than their Argu-  
ments. In this way my Adver-  
sary hath notably distinguished  
himself, and furnished us with such  
an Exquisite Piece of Railing;  
that however I found it no diffi-  
culty to answer his Objections,  
yet it required some Care to ma-  
nage him with Decency, and not  
suffer my self to be drawn by his  
Provocations, to say any thing  
that is unbecoming the Dignity  
of



**Dedictory.**

of my Profession, as a Christian  
and as a Minister.

**WHAT** I have done I now  
offer with all Humility to Your  
Lordship, as a small Testimony,  
but the best I could give, of a  
Heart full of Gratitude and Re-  
spect; which is the only Apology  
I make for this Dedication.

**ONE** thing, I know, will re-  
commend the following Discourse  
to Your Lordship, which is an Ho-  
nest Zeal which it carries in it for  
the Church of England: A Zeal  
that hath influenced Your Lordship  
in far greater Matters; and that  
hath made Your Conduct so sted-  
dy in the Various Turns of Affairs,  
to Your own great Honour, and  
our great Advantage.

**A**

**FROM**

## The Epistle

FROM hence it is, that we could not reflect on Your *Lordship* but with a very high Esteem, as well under Sufferings, as in more Prosperous Times: as well under Your Confinement in the Tower, as lately, when on an Occasion most Glorious to *England*, You were heard at *St. Paul's* with so much Applause, by the most August and Illustrious Assembly in the World.

WHEN in a late Unhappy Reign, Your *Lordship* was brought before the Ecclesiastical Tribunal, erected on purpose for such Work, and imprison'd with the other Lords Your Collegues, we were in great Pain, whilst the Agents of *Rome* insulted and triumph'd; having the Three Kingdoms in their view, as so many Conquer'd Nations

### Dedicatory.

tions prepared for their Conversions.

**BUT** upon Your Deliverance, as they had the Mortification to see their Measures broken, and their Designs defeated : As they were in great Confusion, together with others who had Ill-will at Zion : So we were like unto them that dream : Our Mouth was filled with Laughter, and our Tongue with Joy. We then acknowledged, That our God had done great Things for us, for which we were glad.

THE Fame of this did soon spread itself all over Europe, and it tended much to the Reputation of our Church in Protestant Countries. *Ulricus Huber* concludes *\* Ex eo quod postea ausu venisse vidimus*

**A 4** That *sub Rege Pontificio, Papatu constantius & aequabilius quam Presbyteriani & Independentis restiterint, idem verisimile non videtur. Huber. Ker. Gest. &c. Tom. 3. p. 247.*

## The Epistle

That the " Report in the Reign  
" of K. Charles I. that the Bishops  
" design'd to bring in Popery,  
" was improbable, because, as he  
" says, under a Prince of the Ro-  
" man Communion, they more  
" stedfastly resisted Popery than  
" the Presbyterians and Indepen-  
" dents. It appears to us, I con-  
fess, but a mean Commendation to  
oppose Popery better than Presby-  
terians and Independents; but I  
consider from whence this Testi-  
mony comes, and what strange  
Misrepresentations of Proceedings  
here had been made abroad by  
the Sectaries.

NO sooner was this Storm  
blown over, but we were assaulted  
from another Quarter. *Arians*,  
*Socinians*, and others, appear'd o-  
penly in the Face of the Sun, and  
publish'd their Blasphemies against  
out

### Dedictory.

our Blessed Saviour. And amongst the rest was the Head of a Colledge in Oxford, subject to your Lordship's Visitation: and it is well it was so. For when he was there poisoning our very Fountains, and labouring to infect the Youth of Your Diocese, Your Lordship put a Check upon him by a very Seasonable Piece of Justice.

I know not of what Sect he was, or under what Denomination to reckon him; But he seem'd to me to be a strange Mixture of Christian and Mahometan. And yet was he so strongly supported, that any less Courage than that he had to contend against, would have been baffled by him. But he was forced to yield to a Superior Genius, and so the University was freed from the Scandal he had given.

THE

## The Epistle

THE News of this did soon fly beyond the Seas, and I have seen several Accounts of it from Foreign Parts : But the fullest is that of Mons. *Jurieu*, out of which I shall crave leave to recite a few things wherein he has done Your Lordship Right.

ON the occasion of the Proceedings against the Author of the

*Naked Gospel*, he says \*

\* *Nous avons à Mons. l'Evêque d'Exeter une Obligation qui mérite un monument Eternel de notre reconnoissance. Jur. la Relig. du Latitudinaire, p. 416.*

“ Our Obligation to the

“ Bishop of Exeter, is

“ such as deserves an E-

“ ternal Monument of

“ Thanks. Again, We

“ owe it at present to this Great

“ Bishop, that we are able to stop

“ the Mouth of the Latitudinari-

“ ans on this side the

“ Sea, who had the Har-

“ diness to tell me, and

“ report it every where,

“ that

*Nous avons donc présente-ment l'Obligation à ce Grand Evêque d'avoir de quoi fermer la bouche à nos Latitudinaires de ça la mer, &c. Ibid.*



### Dedicatory.

“ that the Divines, the Universities,  
“ and the Church of England,  
“ were Latitudinarians, and held,  
“ that there is no Necessity of be-  
“ lieving the Doctrines which we  
“ call Mysteries of the Church.  
He rejects this as a very great  
Slander, as he had reason, and  
he thus concludes, “ We are in-  
“ formed by Letter, That the Bi-  
“ shops will apply themselves in  
“ good Earnest to repress this In-  
“ solent Sect. But the Bishop of  
“ *Exeter* having put  
“ himself at the Head of  
“ the Good or Ortho-  
“ dox Party, and hav-  
“ ving first begun the  
“ Work, he deserves that  
“ we should have for him a Sin-  
“ gular Veneration.

*Mr. l' Evêque d' Exe-  
ter s' étant mis à la tête  
du bon Parti, ayant com-  
mence le premier, merite  
que nous ayons pour luy  
une Veneration Singuli-  
ere, p. 417.*

*My*

## The Epistle

**My LORD,**

I had no Intention to treat You in the usual Style of Dedications, or in the way of Panegyrick: I am my self too Nice to use it, and Your Lordship is too Severe to bear it. I am sensible that, to avoid that, I am fallen into an Excess of Caution; and omitting many things that I might justly have said, I have contented my self to perform the part of a Faithful Historian, in relating some known Matters of Fact, and what Notice hath been taken of them in other Parts of the World as well as our own.

**A L L** observe with what Constancy of Mind you have manag'd the Publick Affairs in which You have been concern'd. And to an Unshaken Firmness of Resolution they

*Dedictory.*

they attribute it, that with great Reputation You have gone thro' Difficulties, which to others would have been insuperable.

BUT then they say, that the same Vertue that appears so Eminently in Your *Lordship*, is common to You with others of Your Honourable Family ; but it must be with this Difference, That Courage which made them so Intrepid in the Field, hath been Consecrated by Your *Lordship* to the Service of the Church : What they exercised at the Head of their Troops, You have transferr'd to the *Administration of Government*. In which may You long, very long and happily Preside.

MAY Your Children live, as they have begun, to be the *Delight and Ornament* of their Country:  
and

*The Epistle*

and may they even exceed the Great Hopes they have raised in Your Lordship and their Excellent Mother, and in all that know them.

MAY they perpetuate Your Name with Increase of Honours, and furnish the Church and State with Bishops and Generals, whose great Actions may make a Considerable Part in the Annals of Future Times.

THESE are some of the Unfeigned Wishes that I put up to Heaven, who am with all Imaginable Respect, and as it becomes me,

29 MR 59

My LORD,

Your Lordship's most Obedient  
and most Humble Servant,

Robert Burfough.

THE

# CONTENTS

Of the following Letter to  
Mr. S. S. *Ormonde*

THE Introduction, P. 1.

SECT. I. Of the Unity of the Church, 11

SECT. II. Of the Separation of the Dis-  
senters from the Church of England, 84.

SECT. III. Of their setting up Churches  
against the Conforming Churches; and  
of the Ordinations of their Pastors, 150.

The Conclusion, 185.

A

THE  
CONTENTS  
Second Letter

TO

Mr. S. S.

29 MR 59

THE

exp  
best  
tle  
ly  
you  
tell  
for  
nec  
ted  
It w  
with  
gave  
of w  
is u  
of a



THE  
Introduction.

S I R,

Y OUR *Second Letter* to me, as you call it, was publish'd at a time when I was engag'd in Publick Affairs: And as I had not then, so neither could I shortly expect, any Hours of Leisure, that I might bestow upon it. But as soon as I got a little Freedom from other Business, I carefully perus'd it; and being resolv'd to give you my Thoughts of it Impartially, I must tell you, in the First Place, That your Plea for the *Pungency of your Style* was very unnecessary, and might well have been omitted; for I discover'd in it no such Quality. It was the Dull Railing and Rude Scurrility, with which your Papers abounded, that gave me Offence: And what I complain'd of was, Your writing in such a manner, as is unworthy, not only of a Christian, but of any Man of an Ingenuous Education, or

B

even

## The Introduction.

even of common Humanity. But instead of reforming upon so just an Admonition, you go on in your own Way; and with your usual Pungency of Style you tell me, That one would think I had lost my Wits and Conscience together: And that I am fall'n into a Raving Delirium and a loud Paroxysm: You impute to me Stupidity, Bigotry and Phrensy; and say, That Jealousy hath fill'd my Head with Bugbears. You accuse me of being Unjust and profanely Irreligious, and represent me as a Person that is instigated by the Devil. You suggest, that I am influenced by an Impotent Spite, and that my Zeal hath embark'd me in the design of ridding the World of the Puritans, and with them, of all the Northern Heresy. You say, That I would send the Dissenters to Hell: And some of them, it seems, I would dispatch quickly thither, if it be true what you also tell me, That though I am not for executing all without Exception, yet the Ringleaders amongst them, amongst whom doubtless I reckon you and the rest of your Order, may expect no more Pity from me than Dogs. You demand, Whether it be Death to me to let you live in Peace amongst us? Whether it be the want of my former Prey which makes me roar against you? And whether I cannot satisfy my self without your Blood? You have hardly a Page which does not afford such Pungencies: And if these be the Teeth you speak of, the Sharpness of which the Owner is not so apt to feel as he that is bitten by them, I can assure you, on the contrary, that they make no Impression upon me, but such as arises from Pity or Contempt.

Contempt. But they seem to be a keen Satyr upon your self, and leave on you evident Marks of a baffled Cause, that could not be supported with Argument; but was to be defended with Calumnies and Reviling Language, or, to use a Phrase of your own, with the *Mire and Dirt of your Expressions*.

IN your former Letter you made me such an Instance of Cruelty, that to come up to your Description of me, I must be possess'd with a Rage that is unsatiable as the Grave, and boundless as Eternity. What you said under this Head, was so very remote from all Probability as well as Truth, that I might have expected from you a Publick Recantation of it; but so far are you from this, that you heap more Outrages on me, and others of far greater Worth. Yet I confess, you have done me some measure of Right in the Evasions by which you would escape the Imputation of Slandering: For these are such as plainly shew, that you did not believe the Villanous Things which you laid to my Charge: But, at the same time they fix on you the Infamy of a false Accuser.

I. ONE of your Evasions is, That what you said of the violent Prosecutions of your Teachers, is not to be apply'd to me, nor is it to be understood of any single Person, but a Party, and to think otherwise was my Mistake. I shall therefore set down your own words, and then we may see whether

Lett. 1. Pag.  
109, 109.

they will bear this Interpretation. *You came upon the Dissenting Ministers, say you, with the Advantage of a Secular Arm, and turn'd them headlong by Hundreds ex Officio & Beneficio; you exchange'd their Pulpits for Prisons, and their Maintenance for Fines, Mulcts and Confiscations: And in vain do you tell us of your Charity, when we taste and see what the bitter Fruits of it are. And now Sir was it not on me that you made this Reflection? Was it not I that told you of my Charity to the Dissenters, of which you say the Fruits are so bitter? And is it not the very same Person that you say came upon your Pastours with a Secular Arm, and did the rest of the Work, as set forth in the Indictment? Certainly you mention no other, nor do you so much as intimate that I had any Associates: Neither indeed are the Expressions which you use, and address to me alone, capable of any such Construction as you would now put upon them. But it being manifest that I neither did nor could do such Execution as you have ascribed to me, nor have any share in it: Now you pretend you spake not of me, but a Party. That is, rather than acknowledge your Offence, you would relieve one Falshood with another; and shift off the Guilt of the Wrong you have done me by a palpable Self-contradiction.*

**BUT** I pray, Sir, who are the Party, and where do they dwell, who, as you say, would tear the Dissenters in pieces, and make their Houses Dunghils, and yet be unsatisfied  
unless

unless  
plain  
of Cl  
Exist  
tome  
confi  
Mate  
Tinct  
tion,  
Cordi  
whose  
of yo  
row'  
with

II.  
me,  
sons n  
Robb  
sugge  
Desir  
me an  
more  
now  
Sense  
conta  
word  
false  
me a  
No!  
vade  
of me  
ings n  
does  
and A  
which

## The Introduction.

unless they could damn them too? To deal plainly with you, I take them to be a sort of Chimerical Monsters, that have no real Existence. But you can raise the Phantoms when you please, and they do you considerable Service in furnishing you with Materials for that rare *Arcanum*; that fiery Tincture, which agrees not with every Constitution, but is prepar'd by a peculiar Art, as a Cordial for one sort of Choleric Patients, with whose Blood it agrees by Sympathy. It is out of your Stores that I have once more borrow'd this Language, but I would not do it without due Acknowledgment.

II. TO avoid the Censure of defaming me, in declaring that I would fill the Prisons with the Dissenters, as with Thieves and Robbers, &c. You now say, That you never suggested this as to my Personal Intentions and Desires. Very well! You have herein done me another piece of Justice: But if you did more than suggest against me, what you now deny, as certainly you did, if any Sense may be made of your words, which contain as formal a Charge against me as words could make; were you not then a false Accuser in affirming such Things of me as never enter'd into my Heart? No, No! That must not be granted; But to evade it, you tell me, That what you said of me is the Natural Consequent of my Arguings with you, and Accusations of you. But does it indeed follow from those Arguings and Accusations, that I did the cruel things which you plainly imputed to me as Mat-



ters of Fact? You dare not now say, That I had them so much as in mine Intention or Desire, and by what Rule of Discourse, or of Equiry, did you then ascribe them to me, as acted by me? You may tell me, perhaps, That you design'd not this: But if, on the contrary, you have done it in expresse Terms, it will be in vain to fly to that Refuge of the worst of Lies or Perjuries, which is a secret Meaning, or mental Reservation. Some have thought it very fit, that Men of your Temper so addicted to Calumny would practise what M. Balzat said, he would be content to do for much less Reason than, I think, you have, that is, that they would go and eat up their own Hearts in the Deserts of Thebais. And so far, I confess, I concur with them, that I could wish, that they who make it their Business to invent and publish false Accusations, however they palliate them when they are discovered, would retire to some lurking Holes where no Eye may see them, no Tongue speak to them, no Ear hear them, 'till they were sufficiently mortified, and having spent their Poison are become fit for humane Conversation.

Pref. Pag. 6. BUT you demand, Whether I did not set forth the Dissenters, as the most Execrable & Hopeless Villains? As the worst of Thieves and Traytors, and much viler than Drunkards and Adulterers? Whether I have not endeavoured to cut you off from the Benefit of the Laws and Government under which you live? Let any one, say you, that understands Sense, but read over your Discourse of Schism, and tell me,

if I ha  
charg  
Punish  
dersta  
may t  
false.  
in the  
that i  
ents of  
were n  
T  
ous Si  
Wrat  
greed  
are en  
nals,  
as such  
that th  
are no  
if you  
turned  
bloody  
they v  
That t  
remom  
fore, a  
they an  
punish  
is not th  
posing t  
plain t  
the bene  
sell, if  
be at y  
wants of  
gainst u



## The Introduction.

7

if I have herein wrong'd you. And is not the charging us with Crimes an exposing us to the Punishments due to them? Sir, you that understand Sense, and have read that *Discourse*, may tell your self that these Suggestions are false. You know that I have confuted them in the Fifth Section of my Vindication. But that is no matter: Such precious *Ingredients* of the *Cordials* for your *Cholerick Patients* were not to be laid aside.

TIS true, I take *SCHISM* to be a hainous Sin, liable as any other Sin to Eternal Wrath. And thus far you and I are agreed. But it does not follow that all that are engag'd in this Sin are hainous Criminals, nor that they ought to be prosecuted as such by the Civil Magistrate: Nor yet that they should be damn'd at last. These are not my Inferences, but your own: And if you will but approve them when they are turned upon you, we shall see into what a bloody Inquisitor, or something worse, they will transform you. You contend, That the Conformists, who impose the Ceremonies, are the *Schismaticks*, and therefore, according to your Way of Reasoning, they are hainous Criminals, and ought to be punish'd as such by the Secular Powers. For is not the charging them with the Crime, an exposing them to the Punishment due to it? It is plain then, that you would cut them off from the benefit of the Laws, and none must buy and sell, if they have not your mark. You long to be at your old Persecuting work again, and the wants of your former Prey makes you roar against us. You say that many amongst us

B 4

are

*The Introduction.*

are *Pelagians and Socinians*, and for their sakes you are mad that the *Writ de Heretico comburendo* is repeal'd. And as for the rest of us, you would not be satisfied in the inflicting on us *Mullets and Imprisonments*, unless you could *Damn us also*, and send us to Hell for *Schismatics*. Nor is your Rage limited to us: for speaking of those that usurp the Pastoral Office, and have no rightly deriv'd Commission, which doubtless is the Case of many Dissenters, even in your opinion, you say, they are *Thieves and Robbers*, and from hence it is clear, that such is your Fury against them, that you would have them hang'd up as *Felons*. And as for those that forsake your Meetings, you say, That they make their Condition worse than that of *Sodom and Gomorrah*; and therefore you adjudge them to something worse than to be burnt alive; and condemn them all without Exception, to the Everlasting Torments of another World.

AND now, Sir, you may see what a monstrous Figure you make, when your own Conclusions are turned upon you, or to speak in your own Phrase, when I have shew'd you your Face in the Glass of your own Argumentations.

HAVING given you this short Specimen of your Work, which may be enlarged in other Places, I shall proceed,

First, TO Vindicate what I have said of Church-Union, of which *Schism* is a Branch.  
Secondly,

*Secondly*, TO enquire, Whether the Dissenters are not guilty of *Schism* in their Separation from the Church of *England*: And,

*Thirdly*, WHETHER they have not aggravated their Guilt? And that 1<sup>st</sup>, in setting up opposite Churches and Officers, or joyning with them. 2<sup>ly</sup>, In admitting or choosing such Pastours as have no Lawful Call to the Ministry.

---

SECT.

There are a variety of ways in which variation from the Control is achieved:

A

**S**

Of the

V

howe  
One  
that i  
that t

AN  
ANSWER  
TO

Mr. S-'s  
Second Letter.

SECT. I.

*Of the* UNITY *of the* CHURCH.

**W**HEN I had prov'd in my  
*Discourse of Schism*, That the  
Church is a Visible and Re-  
gular Society; and that  
however it be disperfed in the World, it is  
*One Political Body*; you readily granted,  
that in some Respects it is fo. You added,  
that the Catholick Church is indeed One,  
and

*Of the Unity of the Church.*

and that therefore he that is duly admitted as a Member in any one True Part or Particular Congregation of this Church, has a Right of Communicating in All; and he that is justly Excommunicated out of One, is cut off from All, because All are but the Integrating Parts of One and the Same Body. You came yet nearer, and said, That *you take Communion in Circumstantial, where it may be had without Sin*, in which Case only I argu'd for it, *to be on several Accounts as desirable as I could represent it*. And here one might have thought that you had given up the Cause, and so put an End to the Dispute between us. And so it must have been would you but have stood to your own Concessions. But you now say, That *I beg the Question, and take it for granted, that Communion with us may be had without Sin*, which, it seems, is the thing in Controversy. And I confess I did take it for granted, That Communion with us might be had without Sin, because you your self granted, That you might sometimes Communicate with us, and that it was your Duty to do so upon certain Occasions; and I thought you would also grant, that you might not Sin at any time, nor be wicked upon Occasion.

BECAUSE I affirm'd, That the *Catholic Church* is One Body, you imagin'd that I held it necessary that all Churches should have the same Ceremonies: But this I shew'd you was a groundless Mistake; whereupon you now say, *What the Opinion*

*was*



## Of the Unity of the Church.

13

was that I held as a Secret to my self, you cannot divine. And could I divine that That would be a Secret to you, which had been universally known and receiv'd as a certain Truth over the Christian World? Finding you much in the dark about this Matter, I referr'd you for your Satisfaction to S. Firmilian and S. Austine, who were both very Zealous Assertors of Outward Ecclesiastical Unity, and yet thought it very consistent with different Rites in distant Countries. And for your farther Instruction, and to let you see what was the Sense of the Primitive Churches and of our own, I directed you to Socrates and Sozomen, and to the Preface before the Common-Prayer; and I shall only add the Words of the XXXIV. Article of the Church of England, which run thus: *It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places One, or utterly like: For at all times they have been diverse, and were, and may be changed according to the Diversity of Countries and Mens Manners, so that nothing be ordain'd against God's Word. Whosoever, through his private Judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word, and be ordain'd and approved by Common Authority, ought to be rebuk'd openly, (that others may fear to do the like) as one that offendeth against the Common Order of the Church, and hurteth the Authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the Consciences of weak Brethren.*

NOW



*Of the Unity of the Church,*

NOW, Sir, all this was a *Secret* to you, you were ill advised by your Friends to enter upon a Controversy, for which you were so unprepar'd, and to oppose the *Church*, when you were so little acquainted with her Principles.

YOU say, *I tell you that we are equally obliged to hold Communion with the Universal Church in all its Rituals and External Modes of Worship.* But where I have done this you do not shew, and that for a very good Reason. You take the Liberty to feign for me any Absurdities; but have the Discretion not to inform your Readers where they are to be found, lest the Imposture might easily be discover'd. I know very well, that when the *Church* was dispersed over the World, her Rituals and External Modes of Worship were so different in different Countries, that to use them all at once was impossible, as it was to be personally present in distant Places, and actually to communicate with all Ecclesiastical Assemblies, at the same time. But what I affirm is, that by an actual and constant joyning in all the Parts of Divine Worship, with that sound part of the *Catholick Church* with which we are resident, we virtually communicate with all the Faithful upon the Face of the Earth.

*WAS there not, say you, a time when the Catholick Church was but One Individual Church, yea, a Congregation at Jerusalem? And you have not told us by what Law or Right*

any

## Of the Unity of the Church.

15

any of these Churches, that first issued, and were numerically divided from that Original Catholick Church and Congregation, did vary as to their Rites and Terms of Outward Communion, from that out of which they sprang, or how it could be done without that which you call Schism.

Y O U have more to the same purpose, which is all nothing but Mistake. The Christians over the World were not Colonies drawn from Jerusalem, or any one City whatsoever. But the Apostles and their Fellow-Labourers went about to Disciple all Nations, and when they made Converts, they form'd them into Churches, and then govern'd them and set things in order, as they thought most expedient, within their several Precincts. Their Successors after them did the same, having the same Authority. And their Regulation of things Indifferent, according to the Traditions which they had received, or the various Exigencies of Times and Places, was a cause that, in Churches remote from one another, the Ceremonies were so different. But when Debates did arise about such Matters, the Way in the Primitive Times was, for the Bishops to decide them in their Synods by mutual Agreement. But the Popes afterwards, labouring to grasp all Power into their Hands, used all possible Means to ruin the Discipline of the Church, and introduc'd such intolerable Corruptions as none could comply with without Sin.

OUR

*Of the Unity of the Church.*

OUR Fathers therefore were oblig'd to abandon their *Communion*, and they did it accordingly. And such as had the Publick Administration of Affairs, did manage it so happily, that they have not requir'd our Assent to any Doctrine, or urged any thing upon us as a part of Divine Worship that is not grounded on the Word of God. And as for Indifferent things, they order'd them so exactly according to the Rules of Christian Prudence, that considering all together, in the Opinion of very Learned and Disinterested Judges, the *Church of England* was the best Part, and the very Glory of the Reformation.

BUT if our Reformers had Reason to depart from the Church of Rome, and a Right to order all Matters that are but of Human Institution, and allowable by the general Rules of Scripture, have not the Presbyterians as much Reason to forsake the Church of England, and the same Right for their Ecclesiastical Constitutions? So you pretend. But you might as well tell me, That a Just and a Causeless Breach of *Communion* are the same thing, and that our Lawful Governours have no more Authority than such as were under their Jurisdiction, but unjustly revolted from them.

YOU say, That to maintain the Unity of the Catholick Church, I hold, we are obliged to use all Modes of Worship, whatsoever they are, that are appointed by Men as a Condition of Communion with it. But at this rate, you need

need not read the Books, which you would confute, but invent any Monstrous Propositions, and fasten them on your Adversaries, and these you may skirmish at pleasure, and your Work is done.

Y O U know very well, that I have pressed Communion no farther than it may be had without Sin; no more than as it is agreeable to Christ's Institution. You know I have declar'd it, as a thing most certain, That the Publick Worship of God ought to be celebrated with such Ceremonies as are suitable to the Dignity and Solemnity of the Work, and are agreeable to the General Rules of the Holy Scriptures. And then you must needs also know, I am far enough from asserting, That whatsoever is appointed by Man in Rituals, as a Condition of Communion, which may comprehend the most Criminal Acts imaginable, ought to be done by us, as you would have it be thought.

Vind. p. 184

Disc. p. 38.

p. 16.

I cannot but admire that you should so confidently affirm what is so notoriously false, and what you know to be so. But when your *Loud Paroxysms* come upon you, you publish any thing to the World, without any regard either to Truth or Probability.

T O preserve the Unity of the Catholic Church, Two things, I said, were more especially requisite. The first is, that every Christian actually Communicate

C

with



*Of the Unity of the Church.*

with that Sound Part of the Catholick Church which he finds where he resides, or where Divine Providence casts his lot. The second, that Private Christians ought to obey the Spiritual Guides, who are therein lawfully established.

p. 9, 12

HERE you tell me, *I prescribe a Catholick Antidote, which is a Composition of Two Simples. But it is like to prove a very Inartificial and Deletory sort of Medicine, if made up after my loose and general way, as to the first Ingredients of it.* And it must be better examin'd, and duly corrected before it can enter into the Composition, *ex duobus.* You also add several Exceptions, such as they are, against the second, in which notwithstanding, you say, *lies the main force and virtue of the Medicament.* Sir, I am well enough content, that you please your self with this Cant, and I do not envy you the Post to which it may recommend you. I shall only in plain English defend my own Assertions, and leave others to judge of the Tryal or Skill which you have made upon them.

I. MY first Proposition was, that every Christian ought actually to Communicate with that Sound Part of the Catholick Church, which he finds where he resides, or where Divine Providence casts his Lot. To clear this, I said it is to be observ'd, that there is a nearer Alliance amongst the Faithful remaining in the same Place, than there can be amongst those that are of distant Countries. These Words you cite, and



and then breaking off the Discourse, as if I had said no more on the Subject, you cry out, *What Alliance there is between your Arguments and your Conclusion, I must confess my self too dull to comprehend. One would think you had a mind to lampoon upon your self. But perhaps by Clearing your Position, you did not mean to prove it, but to clear your hands of it.* But was it not to clear your hands of something you could not answer, and to impose on your Credulous Friends, who do not suspect you of any such disingenuous dealing, that you conceal'd the Instances which I gave to confirm my Proposition; and which make it evident, that the Alliance, I mention'd, is such, as destroys the Pretences for Separation? I shew'd you, that when there is mention in Scripture of a Country or a Province where the Gospel was receiv'd, we read of the Churches of it. But when the Discourse is of the Christians of a City, then the Stile is alter'd, and we read of the Church in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Corinth, and so of the rest. And what could be the reason of this difference of Stile but only this? The Christians of distant Cities were so many distinct Societies, as could only virtually Communicate together, and were under their several Governours, who having the same Plenitude of Power, were alike Independent on one another. But all the Faithful of a City were of one and the same Society, and oblig'd to worship God together, so long as it was practicable, and how numerous soever they were, they were to remain

*Of the Unity of the Church.*

as one Corporation under the same Authority and Administration of Discipline.

BUT in *Jerusalem* and other Cities, their number, in a short time, so much increas'd, that they could not meet together in one Place, and then it was necessary that they should be regularly distributed into several Congregations, within certain Bounds and Limits. But all those Congregations, according to the Scheme which I have taken from Scripture, were to be of the same Church, the Church of the City to which they did belong, and to remain under the same particular Government. And by a parity of Reason it follows, that for the preservation of Unity and Order, it was the duty, and is so still, of every Christian to be of the Congregation of the Parish or District in which he had fixed his Residence, when it may be without sin, or, which is the same in Effect, actually to Communicate with that found Part of the Catholick Church where Divine Providence hath cast his Lot. This is what I affirm'd, and whether I have clear'd it, or had need to clear my hands of it, let others judge.

I have taken it for granted, that in the first Age there were many Congregations of the same Church, because the Assembly of Divines and other Presbyterians have prov'd it in the Books to which I refer'd you; but in this I differ from them, that I take the Government of the Churches to have been Episcopal, for reasons which I have given in another

another Treatise. But I think they say very right, where they tell us, that *Parochial Churches are true Visible Churches of Christ, and most convenient for mutual Edification.* But gathering Churches out of Churches hath no See the Pref. footsteps in Scripture, is contrary to Apostolical to Just Divin. Practice, is the Scattering of Churches, the Regim. Eccl. Daughter of Schism, the Mother of Confusion, but the Stepmother to Edification.

BUT whatever be the sense of your Brethren, you desire me to consider, how that obligation to Unity in Worship, which I have asserted, agrees with the Doctrine of the Church of England, which in the Rubrick of the Communion hath barr'd that Ordinance against several kinds of immoralities; and this I have consider'd as you advise, and find at first view, that if the Men and their Immoralities were inseparable, the Church would have them always excluded from the Lord's Table, and there would be some ground for your Exception. But in warning the Offenders not to come without repentance, she intimates, that upon their repentance they may and ought to partake of the Holy Supper. And supposing that they may cease to do evil and learn to do well, and reform their lives, as certainly they ought, she requires all Parishioners to Communicate at least Three times in a Year. Which is agreeable to the Advice which S. Paul gave to the *Corinthians*, on occasion of their great Enormities at the Sacrament: For he did not forbid them to partake of it any more, but said he, *Let a man examine him-*

## Of the Unity of the Church.

himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup.

II. IT is the duty of Private Christians to obey the Spiritual Guides, which are lawfully established in any Sound Part of the Catholick Church, where they reside. Remember them, says the Apostle, that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your Souls. --- We beseech you Brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and to esteem them very highly in love for their Works sake, Heb. 13. 7, 17. Thel. 5. 12, 13.

p. 12.

THESE Passages of Scripture I cited in my Vindication: and you commend me, you say, that I am aware not to assert the painful duty of Obedience, but only in favour to my self. But neither did I speak of my self, nor did I mention any particular Persons to whom this painful duty of Obedience, as you call it, ought to be pay'd. Only to confirm my Assertion, I made use of the words of S. Paul without any Exposition. So that your Reflection touches not me howsoever you design'd it, but must fall upon the Apostle, whose Expressions they are, which you treat with so much derision. And he is the Person whom in effect you commend, that he was aware not to assert the painful duty of Obedience, but only in favour to himself. You see what becomes of your scoffing, which, as you have placed it, argues a Profane Spirit, and expresses much of the temper of Korah, who said to Moses and

and *Aaron* take too much upon you, seeing all the Congregation is holy: wherefore then lift ye up your selves above all the Congregation of the Lord? Numb. 16. 3.

WHEN I speak of Spiritual Guides Lawfully Established, you raise some doubt, whether I mean, they were so established by the Law of God or Man. As if I could think that *S. Paul*, on whose Words I grounded my Proposition, had an eye to our Acts of Parliament. I take the Spiritual Pastors to be Lawfully established, who are ordain'd and settled in their Places by sufficient Authority, whether they are favour'd or persecuted by Secular Princes. My business was only to prove my General Assertion abstracting from particular Cases, and therefore I said nothing of the Bishops and Beneficed Clergy of the Church of England. But I now add, that by the Imposition of Episcopal hands they receiv'd their Authority from Christ himself: and the freedom of exercising their Power within certain Limits, is confirm'd to them by the Constitutions both Ecclesiastical and Civil of this Kingdom. This lays a double Obligation on private persons, of Adherence and Obedience to them, and renders the Separation from them something more than Schism.

YOU told me formerly, that there is nothing in the world that you coveted more, than to see such Bishops and Pastors in the Church of England, as the Apostle exhorts



us to obey in the Lord ; that is, such as require nothing of us, but what the Lord requires, that the world may see, how much you disdain to be outdone by any but Flatterers and Sycophants. That is, you would obey the Bishops in performing such things as you must do, whether they enjoyn them or not. There is nothing in the world you more covet than to observe their Commands, but it is only in matters Necessary, and which would be your duty, if there were no such persons on Earth. This I thought a strange way of interpreting the Laws of God, all which you may expound away, or prevent; if you may put such limits to them of your own framing as may serve a Turn, or be for your Convenience.

p. 16.

I thought I had said enough to convince you of the Wickedness of this Practice, but you pass over it without any Notice. You have an easy Way of supplying all Wants, and by the help of a fertile Invention, which you often exercise, you have feign'd for me this Opinion, *That we ought to obey them that have the Rule over us, whether it be according to the Lord's Will or not, if it be their Wills.* This you know, Sir, is Forgery : And yet you could publish it without Fear or Shame.

You go on and say, *Is not this Arrogant and Arbitrary ? What can you say more, unless you will express it in these words, Let us break their Bonds asunder, and cast away their Cords from us.* Alas ! Sir, what is the Matter ?



Matter? What is the Crime that I have committed? Nothing at all, but that I would not suffer you to evacuate the Laws of God, by putting such Restraints upon them as he hath not assign'd or allow'd. I could not endure that you should invade his Jurisdiction, and for this Reason I must be reckon'd not only with Flatterers and Sycophants, but with the Scribes and Pharisees, with *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, and with all the bloody Tyrants that condemn'd the Lord of Glory, and hated and oppos'd his Doctrine. You allow me to come a little behind them, but had I advanc'd one Step farther, I had, it seems, been as hateful as the rest. Such Charges are horrible and injurious; and however they are so common with you that I little regard them, yet they call loudly for your Repentance.

BUT if the Holy Scriptures no where justify Disobedience to Superiors in things Indifferent, such as our Ceremonies are, was there any reason for the imposition of them? To this I answer'd, that there was a necessity of imposing some things of that nature; and that there is a sufficient ground for it from the practice of the Apostles, and their Successors in the best Ages.

I. THERE is a necessity of imposing some things that are in their kind Indifferent, or not particularly requir'd by any Divine Precept. Since without some such things, the Publick Worship of God cannot be celebrated; nor can it be perform'd with Decency, unless some Rule be prescrib'd about

about them. To which, you say, you are forced to answer, that one would think, I had lost my Wits and Conscience together. But what is it that forced you to answer in this manner? I know nothing but the Evidence of Truth, which puts you upon the Rack, and threw you into this Pang of Railing. And give me leave to tell you, Sir, that I am become so well acquainted with your management, that I conclude you are much in distress, when I find you taking refuge in such foul Language.

I cannot say you have lost your Wits, whatever is become of your Conscience. When I observe you sliding by the Instances, I made use of to explain and confirm my Proposition. But I shall here repeat them, that it may appear what it is that mov'd your tender Bile, and threw you into one of your *Loud Paroxysms*.

ONE part, I said, of the Publick Worship is the Singing of Psalms; and this is of Divine Appointment: But the manner of it is not so; and yet it is someway to be determin'd. To clear this, let it be suppos'd, that some would have a Single Person that is skill'd in singing, sing alone; Some a Select Company; Some would have all to sing, that are able; Some would have them all sing together with one Voice; and some would have them sing alternately or in Parts; Some call for This Psalm, and some for That, and some for a Third: And in like manner, Some would have this Tune

and some another, and some dislike both: Some would sing in Rhime, and some in Prose or Blank Verse. And now what must be done in such Cases? Must they altogether desist from Singing, 'till any part of them confutes the rest from Scripture? Then must they lay aside the Work for ever. Or must they all be gratified in their several Ways? That would be impossible. Or must they be left at Liberty, to set up their Notes according to their various Sentiments? That would raise such a Jarring Sound, such a Clashing Noise among them, that they would be to one another as *Barbarians*, and a Stranger coming into their Assembly might think they were mad. It is requisite therefore, that they who have Authority in the Church, should exercise it, as there is occasion, in the directing and deciding such Matters; and to their Sentence the rest ought to submit their Private Opinions. But to this you say nothing.

ANOTHER thing that I insisted on was, That however the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted by our Saviour himself, yet several Circumstances of it were left indifferent. And if some contend that it should be celebrated in the Evening after Supper, as it was at first: Others, that it should be done in the Morning before Day, after the Example of the Primitive Christians: And a third sort would have it done in the Forenoon, as it is usually done in the Church of *England*.  
Again,

Again, if some would have it administered in Leavened Bread, as the *Greeks*; Others, in Unleavened, as the *Latins*: Some in pure Wine, as the *Armenians* and the Reformed generally; and some with Wine mixt with Water, as many of the Fathers in the second and following Centuries: And to come nearer Home, if some would have it delivered to them by the hand of the Minister; others would take it to themselves without such Delivery: Some would receive it Kneeling, some Standing, and some Sitting: Some would make their Approaches for it to the Holy Table, and some would have it brought to their several Seats, which may be remote from thence, and from one another. In these Cases, I said, which are not feigned, or in others like them, what shall determine the Differences as they happen? For my part, I know no other way to put an end to them, and prevent Confusion, but that they who have the Government of the Church prescribe such Rules for that purpose, as they think most agreeable to the general Sense of Scripture, and that the People under them conform themselves to their Lawful Decision. And does not this sufficiently confute some of your Conceits, for the sake of which you have been wresting the Holy Scripture? Does it not demonstrate, that our Governours may require of us some Ceremonies, that the Lord hath not required but left indifferent? And that there is Necessity of their doing so on some Occasions? Does it not plainly follow from hence

that our Rulers might prescribe a fit Gesture at the Eucharist, not commanded in Scripture? And is it not evident, that they had reason to limit us to the use of it, for the keeping of good Order? And that we ought to be concluded by their Determinations? I make no doubt but you saw these Consequences that press so hard upon you, and having no other Reply at hand, you were forced to answer, *That I have lost my Wits and my Conscience together.*

TO this Place I may refer, what I farther said, That some such thing as we call Indifferent, must be allow'd, and that as Conditions of Communion, or we can have no Communion amongst us at all. The particular Place and Hour of our meeting for Divine Service, are not determin'd in Scripture, yet must they be appointed, and when they are made Conditions of our Publick Worship, if we will have any. And when we are assembled, every one must not expect to have things managed according to his Fancy; but some Rules that are not prescribed by any Divine Precept, are to be observed, as Conditions of performing the Work of Religion with Decency, and as Means of preventing Disorder and Confusion.

BUT say you, *Are the Ceremonies you are contending for, as necessary, even ex Natura rei, as Time and Place are for Publick Acts of Worship?*

To



To which I Answer.

I. THAT I have no Dispute with you about the Necessity of Time and Place in general; but the Question is, concerning the particular Place and Hour of Meeting for the Publick Worship of God; and these you confess, are not so positively determin'd to us under the Gospel, as they were once to the Jews. You should have said, They are not at all determin'd in Scripture, yet must they some way or other be determin'd.

AND the like may be said of the Days of solemn Fasting and Thanksgiving. You say, The Fourth Commandment gives a general Rule for such things, and the Circumstances of the People must determine them. But hath the Fourth Commandment markt out to us the Particulars which I have mentioned? And are the Circumstances of the People the same, and will they certainly produce the same Determinations? I know not what Instinct should make the People of one Mind, and keep them in order, or reduce them to it, in such Matters, wherein they would not receive Laws from any Government, nor be concluded by the Decisions of any Authority. I am apt to think, that being all left to do what is good in their own Eyes, either they would hold no Assemblies, let there be never so great an occasion of them, or their Behaviour in them would sometimes resemble the Confusions of Babel, or the Noise of the Cyclopes in Euripides,



*ripides*, when none of them heard what another said. To prevent this, some Rules concerning Things Indifferent ought to be given and observed, that all things may be done decently and in order.

BUT here you say, *The Pinch of the Question lies still, By whom must these Matters be Particularly and Authoritatively determined?* And to this I reply, That they must be Authoritatively determin'd by such as have Authority, and not by those that have none. I suppose it is not the Part of Rulers to be subject to the People that are under their Charge, but the Duty of the People to obey the Rulers that are over them in the Lord.

II. ALL the Ceremonies required of the People in the Rubricks of our Morning and Evening Service, are no more than Two Gestures, and some Gesture is as necessary for Publick Worship as Time and Place. Your Brethren indeed have fill'd all Europe with their Clamour against Impositions as an Intolerable Burthen, which neither they nor their Forefathers were able to bear, and you have done your Part to help on the Cry. Yet after all this Noise, Be it known unto all Men, that all the heavy Load upon Private Persons is only Standing and Kneeling, and that upon fit Occasions.

III. THE Holy Scripture makes no such Distinction as you have done, between the  
De-

Determinations of Time and Place, and the imposing of Ceremonies, which had their Original from Institution, as to approve the one and condemn the other. Both therefore are Lawful: And the latter may be as necessary for the Preservation or Restoring of Order, as the other is for the Celebration of Divine Worship: And even when the Injunctions of our Superiors, prescribing Ecclesiastical Rites, appear Grievous to us or less expedient, if the Matter of them be not Sinful, we ought to submit to them for the sake of Peace, rather than divide the Church of Christ, and act what manifestly tends to the Ruine and Defolation of his Kingdom:

BUT say you, P. 116. *What a Bubble of a Church is that, which will be destroy'd by the Loss of an empty Ceremony? What! Will the World shrink into its Old Chaos, were it not for these little Devices? Are your Ceremonies indeed your God, that upholds all?* These Exclamations, I suppose, you design'd for Arguments; but to speak in your Phrase, they are nothing else but the Vapours of your own Brain, or rather malicious Insinuations without any Ground of Truth.

YOU know very well, that I have been so far from making our Ceremonies my God, or saying, that without them the Church would be destroy'd, and the World shrink into a Chaos; that, with the Church of England, I have declared them to be in their

\* See  
† Ep  
W.

their own Nature Indifferent, and affirm'd it to be reasonable, that upon *Weighty and Important Considerations*, according to the various exigency of Times and Occasions. Such Changes and Alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in Authority should seem either Necessary or Expedient.

Nevertheless I have said and prov'd that the Publick Worship of God can not be celebrated, nor good Order preserv'd without some Ceremonies, or the requiring some things that the Lord hath not required. And it is sadly Evident, that when the Authority, by which our Rites were impos'd, was Insulted and Trampled on; there followed such Confusion, that one of your Party acknowledged in Print, that all Government and Discipline of the Church was laid in her Grave: and all the Putridinous Vermine of bold Schismatics and Frantick Sectaries gloried in her Ashes, making the Fall thereof their own Rising to mount the Pulpits. And another Cry'd out, that the Wolves which were wont to lie in the Woods, are come into the Sheepfold and roar in the Holy Congregation. O thou Shepherd of Israel, why hast thou broken down the Hedge of this thy Vineyard, which thy Right Hand hath Planted? The Boar of the Wood, and the Wild Beast of the Forest do

D

Devour

\* See the Presbyterians Complaint in *Martins Echo*.

† Ephr. Paget. Heref. p. 41. See more to the same purpose in *W. Dugdale's View of the late Troubles*.

Devour it. \* Another complain'd, that the Woful Anarchy wherin the Perverseness of some Men, by the Permission and heavy Plague of God, had for too many Years kept the Church of England, had produced such a Multitude of Heresies and Schisms, as no Heart, in which was the least Spark of Love to God, or Zeal to his Truth, could behold without a great deal of Grief and Compassion.

II. THE Imposition of some Indifferent things is grounded on the Practice of the Apostles and their Successors in the Purest Ages.

AS for the Apostles, we find, that when they met together in the Council of Jerusalem, to put an end to the Debate between the Judaizers and other Christians, they decided the Matter against the Zealots, who contended for the Mosaick Rites: yet to comply with the latter in some measure for the sake of Peace, they thought it necessary, at that time, to lay some Burden on the Gentile Converts, and to require them to abstain from certain Meats, the use of which not only the Law of Nature doth allow, but Christianity itself permitted, except in case of such Prohibition, and the preventing of Scandal. For our Blessed Saviour hath assur'd us, that what goeth into the Mouth Defileth not a Man, Matt. 15. 11. And

---

\* Bailie in his Epist. to Blair before his Vindie. of the Ch. of Scotland. A. D. 1646.

And S. Paul speaking of Meats, hath taught us, that neither if we Eat, are we the better; neither if we Eat not, are we the worse. 1 Cor. 8. 8.

FROM this Example it is plain,

1. THAT the Council might lay a Burden upon the Churches to which there was no Antecedent Obligation from the Scriptures.

2. THAT the Determination of Authority is the best way of deciding Controversies, about things Indifferent, however the Events may not always answer expectation

3. THAT such a Determination being made, it is the Duty of the Faithful to Acquiesce in it, and be concluded by it, because otherwise it would be Useless and Precarious.

4. THAT we may stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us Free, and yet be Abridged in the Exercise of it. So were the Christians by this Decree of the Synod, which as *Diodati* says, was an Ecclesiastical or Canonical Ordinance, as they call it: Not so much to rule the Conscience and Inward Man, as the Outward Actions, for the Peace, Honour, and Order of the Church at that time, in things which in their own Nature were Indifferent, or held to be so by the Gentiles.

YOU Object from the Style of the Decree, *that it was what seemed good to the Holy Ghost, that it was necessary, and that it was made for the Preservation of Peace and Unity amongst Dissenting Brethren.* And in these respects you think it differ'd from the Injunctions which you oppose in the Church of England, and therefore can afford us nothing for the Defence of them. But it is to be considered,

1<sup>st</sup>, THAT however the Council declar'd that the Decree was what seemed good to the Holy Ghost; yet did they ground this their Assertion, not on any particular Revelation or Command received from him, but they gather'd it by Reasoning and Discourse, from the miraculous Gifts which descended upon the Gentiles. Others might have made the same Inferences that could not make the same Injunction. Others might have said, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost*; but only they who had their Commission and Power from Christ, could say to the Churches, *It seemed good to us, to lay upon you no greater Burden than these necessary things, &c.* In which words it is plain, that they so acknowledged the direction of the Spirit, as also to assert their own Authority, This Authority they exercis'd to very good Purpose in the present Case: for the Cities having received the Decrees which was Ordain'd of the Apostles at Jerusalem, submitted to it; and they were establish'd in the Faith and in-



increas'd in Number daily, *Acts* 16. 4, 5.

2<sup>dly</sup>, THE Abstinence from certain Meats, cannot be said to be Necessary under the Gospel, if that Word be taken in the strictest Sense. *For every Creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with Thanksgiving, 1 Tim. 4. 4.* No Creature therefore was forbidden as Unclean, and the Prohibition of any was only a Temporary Provision, very Expedient at that time; as it would still be upon the like Occasions: Yet must it have been Ineffectual, if, when it was made, the People might have neglected it at their pleasure, or oppos'd it as infringing their Liberty.

3<sup>dly</sup>, I T was not more Expedient or Necessary that some Meats should be prohibited, than it was when the Nation was casting off the Papal Yoke, that some Rules should be given by Authority for the Decent and Orderly Celebration of Divine Worship, and the Administration of the Sacraments. And there is no Doubt to be made, that this was better, and tended more to the Honour of Religion, and the Propagating of Truth, than could have been expected, if the People had been generally left to their own Devices.

CERTAIN it is, that the *Act of Uniformity* contributed much to the National Reformation, and that this was carried on with great Success, 'till the Progress of it

was hindred by the Opposition of Dissenting Protestants. *It is Notorious, says Archbishop Whitgift \*, that when the Book of Publick Prayers was Uniformly used, and by all Learned Preachers maintain'd, and impugn'd by none, the Gospel mightily prevail'd, took great Increase, and very few were known to refuse to Communicate with us. But since this, Schism and Division, the contrary Effect, hath fallen.*

A little before, he complain'd of the Dividers, *That by their Contention they administred Occasion of Offence to those who are seduced by the Jesuites, and furnished them Arguments against our Liturgy; whereby they increased the Number of them, and confirm'd them in their Wilfulness.*

IT is evident then, that our Reformers took Right Measures for freeing the Kingdom from the Wicked Errors of the Times, but their Work was hindred, and their Enemies encouraged by False Brethren.

4ly, OUR Reformers, in the Orders they made for the Publick Worship, had a most Charitable Design, and after the Example of the Apostles, used great Moderation in their Decrees, that by their Condescension they might gain Profilytes to the Truth, and all might be brought to main-

---

\* See his Letter to the Lords of the Council in Fuller, Ch. Hist. B. 9. P. 146.

maintain the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace. And in all Probability they had succeeded in it in an Extraordinary Manner, to the great Vexation of Rome and her Agents; but that the Restless Endeavours of the Sectaries brought all into Confusion: And this occasioned another Act of Conformity, the Preamble of which sets forth, That it was made to cure such Schisms as were arisen, and grown up, to the great Decay and Scandal of the Reformed Church of England; and to settle the Peace of the Nation, and to promote the Honour of Religion by an Universal Agreement in the Publick Worship of God.

YOU may see what Care of Unity hath been taken by the Government; and with how little Reason you say, That the things which it hath required of us, have for more than this Hundred Years, divided the Church, and broken the Common Peace of it. But it seems, that to acquit the Offenders you would arraign the Laws: And yet you can discover no Fault in them; nor have your Brethren succeeded better.

Innumerable Volumes have been written again Conformity by the Learned and Unlearned amongst them, and yet not One, for the Hundred Years you speak of, hath been able to prove, That any One Sinful Thing is prescrib'd to us as a Condition of Communion.

D 4

THEY

THEY have been very vehement indeed in pressing for Alterations, but without shewing a sufficient Reason for them, or ever agreeing in their Demands: Only in the Destructive Part, I confess, they have been Unanimous enough, and we know very well what they would pull down, but what they would set up, they have not yet determin'd, nor are they ever like to decide it by a Common Vote.

ANOTHER Argument for the imposing Things antecedently Indifferent, I have taken from the Sanctification of the First Day of the Week by an Apostolical Institution. There was nothing of Præeminence in this Day, nothing of a Moral Excellence, to distinguish it from any other Part of Time; nor is there any Precept for it in the Gospel. Yet since there are plain Intimations in Scripture, that it was kept Holy in the Apostles Days, and that with their Approbation: And since it is evident, from the Writings of the Fathers, that it was universally observ'd afterwards, there is no doubt to be made but it proceeded from Apostolical Appointment. But I cannot carry it higher than to ground it on the Authority, which Christ conferred on the Governours of his Church, and which hath been preserv'd to our own Time, and ought to be so to the End of the World.

BUT

BUT you crave Leave to ask me, Whe- Page 17.  
*ther I will put the Christian Sabbath amongst mine Indifferent Things ?* As if I had said any thing of that Sabbath, or given you occasion for such a Question. I take the Christian Sabbath to be *that Rest of the People of God*, which is begun here in a Freedom from the Service of Sin, and in a Heavenly Conversation, and will be accomplished in the Happiness of another World. And I am so far from reckoning this *Sabbatism*, as the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* calls it, amongst Things Indifferent, that I think we ought to labour to enter into it with the utmost Diligence, *Heb. 4. 9, 11.*

I am, as much as any Man, for a Religious Observance of the Lord's Day, provided it be without Superstition : But I do not find it call'd a *Sabbath* in Scripture, or in the Writings of the Fathers. Nor can I ground it in such manner as you have done on the Fourth Commandment. For if this Commandment determines to us what Day is to be Sanctified, it must be the very Day which it mentions, and not another of which it does not speak a Word. You say, Page 33, *The Morality of the Commandment requires one Day in Seven to be kept Holy.* But I do not see how this can be to your Purpose, if the particular Day of our Worship be left undistinguish'd or undecided by the Divine Law : Nor do I know, what Morality there is in Seven more than in another Number.

I think all the Vertue of it is derived from the Precept it self, which assign'd and fix'd that Day in Seven, which in *Israel* was to be the Time of Rest. And if this Law be Obligatory to us in the Letter of it, we must turn Jews in this Matter, and keep the Saturday Sabbath.

THUS did some in the last Age \*, and justified their Practice from such Reasonings as you have now made use of, and in which they had been fully instructed by the Books and Sermons of the Nonconformists. And there was no way to convince them of their Error, but by shewing that the Principles which they had learn'd from their Masters were false: That under the Evangelical Dispensation an End was put to the Jewish Sabbath, and that we are under no Obligation from the Law of *Moses* to observe Days any more than Months or Years. All which hinders not but that the Apostles set apart the First Day of the Week for the Solemn Assemblies; and you may call it a Sabbath if you please; for I would have no Controversy with you about the Name, if there be no Judaizing in the thing. I shall only tell you, That it was not upon a Jewish Account, nor out of any Necessity of preferring one Day before another, that they made Choice of this time for the Publick Worship, but as thinking it the fittest for the Commemoration of our Saviour's Resurrection.

See Galat. 4.  
10, 11.  
Coloss. 3. 16

---

\* See Bp. *White's* Treatise of the Sabbath, P. 307.



irrejection. And there being the same Reason for the Continuance of this Festival that there was for the First Institution of it; and the same Occasion of it always for the Purposes of Religion that there was at the Beginning; there being also the same Authority to inforce it, and the Examples of all the Churches to recommend it, as it hath been thus far, so it ought to be celebrated in all succeeding Ages.

I cannot say thus much of another External Rite, that I come now to mention, which yet is deriv'd from the same Original. This is the *Anointing with Oil* of which S. James speaks in the fifth Chapter of his Epistle V. 14. *Is any sick among you? says the Apostle there, let him send for the Elders of the Church, and let them Pray over him, Anointing him with Oil, in the Name of the Lord.* Here is a plain Injunction, you see, for the *Anointing with Oil*: And it must be confess'd, that this hath been in use both in the Primitive Times, and in latter Ages, and that not only amongst the Latins, who grossly perverted it in their Sacrament of Extream Unction, but also amongst the Greeks and Russians, Egyptians and Ethiopians, and many others. And yet this Ceremony is generally laid aside by the Reform'd, and particularly by the Church of England: our Governors not doubting, but that they had Power to give Rule in such Matters as are not of the substance of Religion, and for which, there is not always the same Reason, and to order them in such manner

manner, with Respect to Time and Place, as might best promote the Honour of God, and the Edification of the People. But why they Retained some things of that Nature and Rejected others, they inform you in the Preface before the Common Prayer.

*S. Paul*, in several places of his Epistles, grounds his Reasonings on some External Rites, which were then in use, and as we may justly think, not without his Allowance. When he Discourses of the putting off the Old Man, and also says, that they that are Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, he takes these Figures of Speech from the Change of Apparel, which was us'd at Baptism. And when he tells us, that so many of us as were Baptized into Christ, were Baptized into his Death, and are Buried with him in Baptism, he intimates, that the Administration of Baptism was ordinarily perform'd in such a Manner, as to Resemble our Lords Burial: and from this Symbolical Representation he argues, that we should Die to Sin, and arise unto Newness of Life.

AMONGST the Ecclesiastical Rites of those Times, we may reckon the Offerings which the Christians brought into their Publick Assemblies, and the Repasts they made out of them, and that at first before the Sacrament, whatsoever the Custom was afterwards. *S. Paul* takes notice of this in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, where he Reproves them indeed on that occasion

occasion, but not on the Account of the Collations themselves; it was only because of their Intemperance and the great Disorders, of which they were guilty at those Entertainments. He does not upbraid them, as Symbolizing with the Jews, nor yet Gentiles, who had the like Feasts\*. But what gave Offence was, that every one, as he came first, would take before others his own Supper. So that there was no Charitable Communication to the Poor, but whilst one was Hungry, another was Drunk. V. 21. Whereupon he says, *Have ye not Houses to Eat and Drink in? Or Despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not?* V. 22. *What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.* As if he had said, I cannot but Reprove you for casting such Contempt on your Indigent Brethren, as ye do when you will not wait for their coming, but Drink to Excess, and Feed Luxuriously on the Provisions which they want. But he was only desirous to remove these grievous Abuses, which being Corrected, he was for the Continuance of the former Practice, as appears from these Words, *Wherefore my Brethren, when ye come together to Eat, tarry one for another.* V. 33.

IT

---

\* Vid. Coteler in Constitut. Apost. L. 2. N. 83. & Comment. Balduini in Epist. Plin. 97.

IT is certain that these *Agapa*, as they were call'd were continu'd when S. *John* wrote his Epistle, and that with good Allowance: For he speaks of them, where he says to those that were Sanctified, concerning others that were a great Dishonour to Religion, *These are Spots in your Feasts of Charity*. V. 12. A sort of Language that he would not have us'd, if the Feasts themselves had been *Spots* also. On the contrary, he intimates by this Expression, that they were Laudable: and by the Title he gives them †, he shews that they were design'd and employ'd by Good Men to a right End, and made a part of the Communion of Saints.

THESE Spiritual Banquets were kept up long after the Apostles Days; as may be gather'd not only from St. *Ignatius*, *Clement*, *Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, and many other Christian Writers, but from *Plinius Secundus* \*, and *Julian* the Apostate. But being turn'd into a kind of Revels, and being charged with great Enormities, to remove the Scandal, they were abolish'd, or excluded from the Places of Publick Worship, not in a Tumultuary Manner, or by Private Persons, but by the Provincial Councils

---

† *Cæna* nostra de nomine rationem sui offendit. Id vocatur quod dilectio penes Græcos, Tertul. Apolog. C. 39. P. 30.

\* Vid. Plin. ad Trajan. Ep. 97. Julian. Fragment, Pag. 305. Edit. Spanhem.

Councils of *Laodicea* and *Carthage*; as also Concil. La-  
by one of the Canons of the Universal od. Can. 98.  
Church confirm'd by *Justinian*. But in some Con. Carth.  
Churches, the Custom hath been continued 3. Can. 20.  
to our own Times. Cod. Univ.  
Can. 132.

TO pass to other Rules of the most  
Early Times, I observ'd, that when *S. Paul*  
says to *Timothy*, (1 *Tim.* 2. 8.) *I will that*  
*Men Pray every where, lifting up holy Hands,*  
his Words have respect to Two Ceremo-  
nies which were then in use; The One is,  
*Lifting up of the Hands* in Prayer; And the  
other is, the *Washing* of them in order to  
it. And by the one was signified the Ele-  
vation of the Mind to Heaven; By the o-  
ther, that Purity of Heart and Conversati-  
on, which ought to be the Preparative of  
our Addresses to God.

AS to the Lifting up of Hands, you ob-  
ject, That if there was for it an Apostolical  
Injunction, it must needs be Universally and  
Perpetually Obligatory. But this Consequence  
I deny: For as we have partly seen already,  
there are many such Rules in Scripture,  
which are only Temporary Directions, and  
liable to Alterations, and may be known to  
be so from the Nature of the Things en-  
joy'd by them, and the Sense and Practice  
of the Churches. When the *Psalmist* says,  
*Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker*, Ps.  
95. 6. He requires a very fit Posture for  
Divine Worship, especially on the Occasi-  
on which he had before him. But he did  
not make it Necessary at all Times. The  
Jews

Pag. 20.



*Jews* might sometimes Pray standing, and so might the *Christians*, at such Seasons as they were obliged to it by the Canons of the Church, to which, in Things of that kind, they doubted not but it was their Duty to pay a ready Obedience.

THE other Ceremony which I mention'd, and to which the Apostle alludes, is the *Washing of the Hands* in order to Prayer. That there was such a Custom amongst the *Jews*, I proved from *Aristeas*, and the thing is otherwise manifest, and you do not deny it. And that the same Rite was used by the Gentiles, may be gather'd from Ancient Authors, both *Greek* and *Latin*, whose Testimonies may be seen together in the Collections which have been made by *Spondanus* \* and *Dr. Spencer* †, and other Modern Writers. Yet, however, this Rite had been abused, it was received by the *Christians* as expressive of that Purity with which they address'd themselves to the only True God. And *St. Paul*, who knew this, did not at all reprove them for it, when he took Notice of it so publickly; and from hence we may conclude, that it was unblamable. Otherwise, we may be sure, he would have condemn'd them for it, and not have suffer'd the Sin to have rested on them: *For he kept himself pure from the Blood of all Men, and shunned not to declare the whole*

---

\* Spondan. in Iliad. L. 6. P. 111.

† Spencer de Leg. Heb. L. 3. P. 678, &c.



whole Council of God, Acts 20. 26, 27.

YOU say, That if the Apostles approved this, as a Religious Rite belonging to Christian Worship, (you should have said, as a Rite that was us'd in order to that Worship) he never learned it of his Lord and Master, who so expressly condemn'd it, Mat. 15. 9. Mark 7. 7, 8, 9. That is, if the Apostle entertain'd not your ignorant Conceits, he must needs oppose his Lord: It is evident enough, that our Lord, in the Places to which you have referr'd me, does not condemn the Commandments of Men, nor an Obedience to them, but the Teaching them for Doctrines, or making them a necessary Part of Worship. He was not against Washing of Hands before Meat, for as you say of Paul, he was no Enemy to Cleanliness; nor does he say a word of it, as it was Preparatory to Divine Service. But what he did was to Censure the Jews for placing Religion in such little Things, whilst they neglected the great and weighty Matters of the Law.

OUR Saviour himself, before the Institution of his Supper, washed his Disciples Feet, and required them to do the like. For his Words are not to be limited to a meer Figurative Signification, but are Literally to be understood, when he says, *If I your Lord and Master have washed your Feet, ye ought also to wash one another's Feet,* John 13. 14.

E

THIS

THIS Rite was afterwards used in many Churches, and that at the Sacrament. And *Schlichtingius* \*, and other *Socinians*, argued from this Place of Scripture, That it ought to be restor'd: And very right, according to their Principles, who have no regard for Ecclesiastical Authority. But generally the Pastors of the Church have better determin'd, That this Ceremony is not of the Essence of Christianity; and may be laid aside, especially in Countries where it is not of such use, as it was amongst those, who had but little Covering for their Feet, when they had any; and were wont to put off their Sandals, that they might more conveniently lay together upon their Couches to eat their Meat.

IT may not be improper here to mention another Instruction which our Saviour gave to his Apostles; and is expressed in these words, *Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart shake off the Dust of your Feet as a Testimony against them*, Mark 6. 11. Accordingly Paul and Barnabas, at Antioch, did shake off the Dust of their Feet against the Unbelieving Jews, Acts 13. 31. From which Example it is evident, That it is agreeable to the Parity of the Christian Doctrine, to use some proper Symbolical Rites, which may make an Impression upon the Mind by striking upon the Senses.

\* Vid. C. fe-him. Racov. C. 4. & Notas in Locum.

TO return to St. Paul: We find him in several Places of his Epistles, prescribing certain Rules, which are of the Nature of Ecclesiastical Canons, not alike Obligatory in all Times and Places, but to be observ'd when enjoyn'd by Authority. Amongst these we may reckon his Instructions concerning the *Deaconesses*, of which Rank was *Phoebe, a Servant of the Church at Cenchrea*, Rom. 16. 1. as were many others at that time. These are such as the Apostle would have to be Widows indeed, and he farther gave these Precepts about them: That whosoever was taken into their Number, should not be under the Age of Threescore. She must have been the Wife of one Man, and have brought up Children: She must also have lodged Strangers, and washed the Saints Feet. The Women of this Order, being thus qualified, must needs have been very Serviceable for the Works of Charity and Hospitality, but they were more particularly so to those of their own Sex at the time of their Baptism, the decent Administration of which, according to the Way of the Primitive Times, did much depend upon their Assistance. \* It was with good Reason therefore, that their Office was continu'd long after the Apostles days: And yet it is not without Reason, that it hath been long abolish'd, there not being

E 2

such

---

\* De Diaconissis Vid. quæ habet Ger. Vossius in Comment in Epist. Plinii de Persecut. Christian.

such Occasion for it as there was in the first Ages.

THE great Variation of Circumstances may make some Indifferent Rites very fit and decent at one time, and not at another. For Example: The Salutation with the *Holy Kiss*, or the *Kiss of Charity*, Rom. 16. 16. is the Subject of an Apostolical Precept; and accordingly with this Kiss the Men saluted one another, and the Women those of their own Sex in the Christian Assemblies; this being then esteem'd a proper Symbol of their chaste and mutual Love, and of their being of the same Community. But with us there is no such Custom, nor do we think it fit to be restor'd, in the Churches.

UPON the Occasion of what I cited from *St. Paul* for this sort of Salutation, you have thought fit to treat him with great Rudeness and Insolence. And to the great Contempt of his Authority, and the Spirit with which he wrote, you say, *It seems Paul was much for Kissing, else he would never have made a Law for the Preservation of so laudable a Custom.* I know not how far this Humour of Scoffing may carry you; or whether you may not, in the next Place, employ your Raillery upon our Saviour himself, who says to *Simon*, Luke 7. 45. *Thou gavest me no Kiss, but this Woman, since I came, hath not ceased to kiss my Feet.* But you had better have reserv'd your Buffoonery for other Matters, and not have spent it upon

upon  
when  
Seat  
among  
of th

Y  
but to  
stoms  
firm,  
Apost  
the T  
YC  
tation  
mongst  
that th  
embrac  
and to  
ciliation  
as were  
as Occa  
Which  
Profane  
I do no  
be used  
it: But  
Lords-l  
Faithful  
semblies  
vine Ser  
Lord's S

\* Vid.  
cur. Ap  
Orat. C.

upon Things or Persons that are Sacred; where it can only serve to place you in the Seat of the Scorners, or give you a Name amongst those that make up the Character of the Last Day, 2. *Per.* 3. 3.

YOU say, That *Paul's Words* amount but to a Direction, how to use their Civil Customs in a Religious Manner. And I only affirm, That this Custom was so apply'd by Apostolical Precept, as it is evident from the Text it self.

YOU grant, That this manner of Salutation was a Symbol of Love and Peace amongst the Hebrews, and other Nations; and that the Apostle would have the Romans to embrace one another with Love and Affection, and to assure one another of their mutual Reconciliation, by all such Lawful Ways and Means as were proper to evidence it, and particularly, as Occasion should be offered with a Holy Kiss. Which is very right, and it shews that your Profane Jest on *Paul* was very Impertinent. I do not say, That this Ceremony was to be used oftner than there was Occasion for it: But that Occasion did occur on the Lords-Days, and at other times, when the Faithful met together in their Publick Assemblies. For it was in the midst of Divine Service, before their partaking of the Lord's Supper \*, and at the End of that

E 3                      Service,

---

\* Vid. Justin. Apolog. 1. C. 83. p. 125. Edit, Oxon. Con-  
stitut. Apostol. L. 8. C. 11. p. 264. Ed. 1698. Tertullian de  
Orat. C. 14. p. 124, 135, Ed. 1675.



*Of the Unity of the Church.*

Service, that they saluted one another with a Kiss of Peace. And without this they thought the Prayers were Imperfect.

BUT If there was an Apostolical Precept for this Ceremony, you demand, by whose Equal Counter-Authority it was, that it was soon after laid aside. And who was it told you, That it was so soon after laid aside? Or where had you this Information? Would you but be at the Pains to consult *Du Cange's* Glossary, or other Books of that kind, you may find many Testimonies collected to your Hand, which make it manifest, that this Custom was continu'd above a Thousand Years after Christ. But you have a shorter Way of Writing, which is to publish with great Assurance any Fictions of your own, or that others have invented for you.

YOUR Supposition that nothing but a Counter-authority Equal to that of Apostles could lay aside a Ceremony enjoy'd by them, is of a Piece with the Rest and very groundless. For the same Authority which Christ himself conferr'd on them, he hath by their Hands transmitted to their Successors, and promised to be with them always to the End of the World. From hence it is that upon Emergent Occasions they have Power to make Alterations in some External Things that are of little moment. But I acknowledge that they ought always to retain such Apostolical Rites, as were

univ  
stan  
O  
Han  
by t  
far,  
ges.  
S. Pa  
impl  
Han  
there  
Rite,  
the C  
many  
thoug  
their

TF  
veral  
Confir  
cal R  
ches,  
Of the  
Hab  
with I  
which  
Time,  
Word  
was no  
sons.  
that P  
maru  
he cou  
er and  
for the



universally receiv'd, and have been of Constant Use in all the Churches.

O F this kind is the Imposition of Hands: For this Ceremony was enjoin'd by the Apostles, and as it hath been thus far, so it ought to be continued in all Ages. *Lay Hands suddenly on no Man*, says S. Paul, 1 Tim. 5. 22. In which Words he implicitly requires *Timothy*, To lay on Hands with Judgment and Discretion. And thereby virtually commands the use of a Rite, which was afterwards retain'd in all the Churches, and is still by our own. But many of your Dissenting Brethren have thought it useless or fit to be rejected in their Mock-Ordinations.

THE same Ceremony was used on several other Occasions, and particularly for Confirmation, which is another Apostolical Rite, that hath obtain'd in all the Churches, and ought to be continu'd in all Ages. Of this the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks, Chap. 6. Ver. 2. Where with Baptisms he joyns Laying on of Hands, which came after them in the Order of Time, as it does in the Method of his Words. But the Administration of both was not always committed to the same Persons. We find in the Acts of the Apostles, that *Philip* Converted and Baptized the *Samaritans*, but something was wanting that he could not perform. To supply this *Peter* and *John*, being sent to them, Pray'd for them, and then they receiv'd the Holy Ghost,

*Of the Unity of the Church.*

*Ghost*, Acts 8. 15, 17. 'Tis true, this Action was then attended with Miraculous Gifts which are not now to be expected: But so was the Constitution of Ministers by Laying on of Hands, and the like may be said of other Ordinances in that Age of Wonders, and if they are to be laid aside for that Reason, we must have none at all.

THERE are other Things which seem to be of very little Moment, such as cutting short the Hair, Uncovering and Covering the Head, which yet the Great Apostle thought worthy of his Care, when the Decency of Publick Worship was concern'd in 'em He therefore gave several Rules about them in one Chapter. 1 Cor. 11. And these being such as give great Light into the Business of Ceremonies, they may here require a particular Consideration.

1. ONE of the Rules prescrib'd by the Apostle is, *That the Man should be Shorn, or have his Hair cut short.* A Thing that, being misunderstood, was the occasion of very warm Debates in the last Age. Voetius contended, *That the Hair should be shorn close to the Skin*; which is like another Assertion of his, *That the Shoes should not exceed the length of the Feet.* Poimenander affirm'd, *That the true Measure of the Hair was known by its covering the Skull, that where the Skin begins to be bare and free from it, there are the proper Limits of it fix'd by the Creator*; and if it intrenches upon these Bounds by covering the

*Ears,*

*Ears;*  
*groups*  
*nister*  
*rous*  
*Peop*  
*the S*  
*masin*  
*prove*  
*the w*  
*and c*  
*after*  
*pinion*  
*thers.*  
*be gra*  
*this P*  
*Law t*  
*clesia*  
*count*  
*be alte*  
*and w*  
*the fan*  
*postles*

TI  
*Nature*  
*Long F*  
*are not*  
*Law of*  
*and In*  
*Good a*  
*had tra*  
*might si*  
*all the I*  
*And Sa*  
*had obe*  
*the Secr*

Ears, or other Parts besides that on which it grows; this is a Transgression. Many Ministers in the Low-Countries were so rigorous in this Matter, that they excluded People from the Communion for exceeding the Standard which they assign'd. But *Salmasius* employ'd a great deal of Learning to prove, that the Apostle did not prohibit the wearing Long Hair, but the adorning and curling it, or the binding it up in knots, after the manner of Women: But this Opinion has been sufficiently confuted by others. All the Difficulty is remov'd, if it be granted, That the Apostolical Rule in this Place is not to be taken as a Divine Law that binds perpetually, but as an Ecclesiastical Constitution, that upon the Account of Difference of Circumstances might be alter'd, or was only Obligatory, when and where the State of Things remained the same as they were at the time of the Apostles writing.

TIS true, the Apostle says, *Doth not Nature it self teach you, that if a Man have Long Hair, it is a Shame unto him?* But we are not to take Nature here strictly for a Law of Nature, which is always Uniform, and Immutable as are the Eternal Rules of Good and Evil. Otherwise the *Nazarites* had transgressed the Law of Nature, *Who might suffer no Razor to come upon their Heads, all the Days of their Separation, Num. 6. 5.* And *Sampson*, who was of their Number, had obeyed that Law, when he imparted the Secret of cutting his Hair; which yet was

was the Symbol of the Divine Presence with him. By Nature therefore we are to understand Custom, and yet not an Universal Custom. The Custom of the most Ancient *Greeks* was, to cherish their Hair and wear it long; as appears from an Epithet given them by *Homer* \*. And this according to *Aristotle* in his *Oeconomicks*, was common to them, with the *Lycians*; As also according to *Pliny*, with the *Galls*, whose Country was from thence called *Gallia Comata*, and according to the same *Pliny* and *Lucan* with the *Ligurians*.

IT was likewise common to them with the *Getae*, call'd therefore *Capillati*, as *Jornandes* testifies; and with the *Britanni*, as we learn from *Caesar*: With the *Indians*, as *Salinus* informs us; And with the *Parthians* and *Persians*, as may be gathered from *Oppianus* and *Marcellinus*.

ALL these Instances are produced by *Spondanus* † in his Commentary upon the *Iliads*; and many more might be added from Antient and Modern Authors ‡, were necessary. But these are sufficient to demonstrate, that this Rule for cutting short the Hair, was not grounded on an Universal Practice, but only on the Custom of certain Nations in the Apostolick Age.

2. THE

\* Καρυοειδής Ἀγαυή.

‡ Spond. Com. p. 28.

† Vid. Rob. Sharrock. V. Cl. Dissert. Sing. de Habitu Crimi

2. THE Apostle instructs the *Corinthians*, That every Man Praying or Propheſying ſhould have his Head uncover'd, V. 4, 7. And yet this was no more than a thing Indifferent, but very fit at that time to be enjoyned.

IT was with the ſame Ceremony that the Heathens worſhipped *Hercules*, and other falſe Deities\*; but to others they paid their Adoration with their Heads cover'd: And no wonder, for there is nothing in the Law of Nature to determine them either way. Neither is there any thing in the Chriſtian Doctrine to limit the Chriſtians to the one or to the other. Only the Apoſtle, as a Wiſe Governour, with regard to a Cuſtom that did then much obtain, makes ſuch a Deciſion in the Matter, as was a kind of Temporary or Local Statute, in an Eccleſiaſtical Affair, which binds not in all Times and Places, but only when and where the Circumſtances are the ſame.

3. THE Apoſtle determines, That in the Chriſtian Aſſemblies the Women ſhould wear their Vails, V. 5, 6. With which, as Learned Men have noted, they were to cover their Heads and Faces. This was conformable to the Practice of the Jews, and of many of the Heathens, but that was not ſufficient

---

\* Vid. Job. Braun. de Veſtitu Sacerdot, Heb. L. 2. C. 4. Sec. 24.



sufficient to give it the Denomination of a Law of Nature, for that would have been unvariable : Nor is there for it any Standing Rule of the Gospel : Only the Apostle enjoyn'd it as an Ecclesiastical Rite, that, according to the Common Practice, was very convenient and comely.

AND for this Reason, and the Regard which was had to this Apostolick Canon, it was long retain'd in the Churches. *Cederenus* tells us, *That Decius forbad this Habit to the Christian Women*; but where he had this Story, or what Credit it deserves, I know not. It is manifest from the Testimony of the Fathers, That it was continu'd long after the Times of *Decius*. And yet it hath been dismissed out of our Assemblies, and we hear no Complaint of the want of it.

WHAT this Apostle, and other Writers of the Holy Scripture, have said of some particular Rites, may be improv'd to a General Use, for our Direction in Things of that Nature, and may afford us these following Observations :

I. THE First may be, That some Rites, or Things Indifferent, may be annexed to the Worship of God, and contribute to the Decent Performance of it, and may not only be Lawful, but Expedient.

THE



THE Covering and Uncovering the Head, were no Parts of Praying or Prophe-  
fying; yet, being rightly used, they con-  
tributed to the Dignity of both. The *Kiss*  
of Peace, and the *Feast of Charity*, were Ad-  
ditions to the Lord's-Supper, yet neither  
Sinful nor Inconvenient; but, on the con-  
trary, were proper Means to promote one  
great End of that Sacrament, which is *Love*  
and *Unity*.

II. NOT only Natural Ceremonies, as  
you call them, but such as are of Positive  
Institution may be annex'd to the Divine  
Worship. This is a Distinction of which  
you serve your self for an Evasion: And  
something I said of it before, to which I  
now add, That if it may be allow'd as Rea-  
sonable, you have apply'd it very unhap-  
pily: For with you, the Uncovering the  
Head is a Natural Ceremony. But neither  
is it from Nature, nor is it so much as  
founded on an Universal Custom. In many  
Nations 'tis not used at all, either as a Ci-  
vil or a Religious Rite; and where it hath  
obtain'd, it hath been upon very different  
Accounts.

THE Womans Vail, which is another  
of your Natural Ceremonies, was not put  
upon her by Nature. Nor is it enjoyn'd  
by any Moral Law, or recommended by U-  
niversal Practice. It was at first of Human  
Invention; and growing afterwards into  
use, it was prescribed by the Apostle, as a  
Matter

Vid. Plin. hist.  
Nat. L. 7. C.  
59.

Matter of Decency in the Publick Assemblies, and that particularly for the performing some Work of Religion. Thus also the cutting short the Hair, as I have shew'd, was not of Nature, but of Art, and is the Business of a Trade, which was not received in *Italy* till above Four Hundred and Fifty Years after the Building of *Rome*, and in many Countries not at all. But in course of Years, short Hair, amongst many Civiliz'd People, becoming a Mark of Freedom and Gravity, it was required by Ecclesiastical Authority, not as a Thing Essential to Religion, but as an Ornament of it. But when and where it ceased to be so, the Obligation to it ceased also.

III. ALL the Ceremonies of the Church ought to be Symbolical: For if they had no Signification, they would have no Use, but would be fit to be excluded from the Churches. Such as I have mentioned from the Scripture, were Visible Representations of the things, on the Account of which they were appointed. As the Uncovering the Head was a Sign of Authority in the Man, and the Vail was a Mark of Modesty and Subjection in the Woman; and the like may be said of the rest.

IV. THE Signification of Ceremonies liable to Variation; according to the difference of Times and Countries; and from hence it is, that as they are not always Symbols of the same things, so they cannot be alike Decent in all Ages and Countries.

\* Co  
† V  
Observa  
C. 3, V.

The wearing Long Hair was, in some Ages and Countries, a Shame to a Man, but in others an Ornament and Badge of Dominion; as the cutting of it short was of Servitude. The uncovering the Head was, with some, an Argument of Power, but with the *Europeans* it became a Sign of Humility and Reverence, and as such we use it in our Addresses to God. On the contrary, covering the Head, that was an Instance of Subjection, is with us expressive of Authority. And on this Account *Ludovickus Capellus*\* justifies those Ministers who preached with their Hats on, as best answering the End of the Apostolical Canon, however they acted against the Letter of it. The Womens Vail was a decent Habit, becoming the Modesty of the Sex, and is still used as such amongst the *Amicks*; but it would not appear so Decent if it were introduced into our Congregations.

THE putting off the Shoes was used not only by the *Hebrews*, as a fit Symbol of Devotion in the Places of Religious Worship; but also by the *Ancient Greeks* and *Romans*†, and since by the *Egyptians* and *Ethiopians*, and many other Nations.

## V. SINCE

---

\* Comment. in 1 Cor. 14. 18.  
 † Vid. Huet. Demonstr. Pr. 4. C. 2. Ezech. Spanhem. Observat. in Callimach. p. 730. Byn. de Calceis Heb. L. 2. C. 2. Vansleb. Hist. de l'Eglise d'Alexand. P. 47.

V. SINCE the Signification of Ceremonies is so variable and liable to change, no standing Rule can be made, prescribing all that shall be fit to be used in all Times and Places, for it might often happen, that it would be contrary to the End for which they were appointed, and no more brought to an Agreement with the General Rule of Decency in the Scripture, than a crooked and straight Line can be made parallel to one another. In which Case the General Rule ought not to be warpt into a Compliance with particular Rites, but such Rites, and such only ought to be enjoyn'd, upon fit Occasions, as are agreeable to that Rule which is the same in all Ages.

VI. WHEN Controversies do arise concerning things Indifferent, it may not be fit that the People be always left to use or reject those things as every One thinks fit. But it may be Expedient, and it is often so, that they that have the Administration of Government should decide such Matters, and give such particular Rules of Discipline as present Emergencies do require. Thus, as we have seen, when there was a great Debate about Certain Meats, the Council of *Jerusalem* determin'd it by their Decree, and when there was a Disturbance at *Corinth* about Habits and Gestures, St. Paul interposed in it, and put an End to it by his Authority. And not being able to dispatch on a suddain all the Work he had there of that Nature, *The rest, he said, he*

Don  
34.  
amp  
in re  
be fo  
Care  
ly be  
Chur  
be gi

7.  
made  
fiastic  
to sub  
Notw  
Opini  
been l  
that t  
too li  
verts l  
Decree  
which  
had v  
concer  
Decisio  
their D  
ed by i  
Cases,  
Brethren  
and keep  
unto yo  
Divines  
which he  
signifies  
en Veri  
our Ro  
world

would set in order when he came, 1 Cor. 11.

34. And it must be granted, that the Example of himself and his Fellow-labourers in regulating Ecclesiastical Affairs ought to be follow'd, unless we will say, that the Care of Decency, and good Order, did only belong to the first Governours of the Church, but afterwards Allowance was to be given to Confusion.

7. WHEN Lawful Constitutions are made by good Authority concerning Ecclesiastical Rites, it is the Duty of the People to submit to them, and acquiesce in them. Notwithstanding, it may be the private Opinion of some, That Matters might have been better order'd. Some might think that too great a Burden; and some, that too little was laid upon the Gentile Converts by the Council of Jerusalem: But the Decree of the Council was the Rule, by which both were to be determin'd. They had very different Sentiments at Corinth concerning some Ceremonies; but S. Paul's Decision was sufficient to put an End to their Debates, and all were to be concluded by it. They had been so before in like Cases, and thereupon he says, *I praise you, Brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances, as I delivered them unto you.* 1. Cor. 11, 2. The Assembly of Divines here observe, that by the word which *Παράσκει* which he uses here, and which in the Original signifies Traditions, he meant not any Unwritten Verities concerning Matters of Faith, such as our Romish Adversaries would force upon the

F

Text,



Grot. Com-  
ment. in Lo-  
cum.

Text, but particular Ordinances of Comeliness, and good Order, which belong to Ecclesiastical Polity, which afterwards were called Canons. Græsius says, That by it we are to understand certain Precepts of that kind, which Christ left to the Prudence of the Apostles and Governors of his Church, pertaining to good Order and Decency; of which sort all are not written, because it was sufficient that by the Authority of the Apostles they might be brought into practice. Of some of them there is mention in the Epistles, not designedly, but incidentally as there was Occasion. See to this purpose, 2. Thess. 2. 13. There were many things of this kind, that by themselves were of little moment with regard to Piety; yet it was profitable that some Rules should be given about them for Publick Use, lest a Disagreement therein should dishonour the Church; and having raised Disputes, might out of the Disputes, as it commonly happens, produce Schisms.

8. WHEN Ecclesiastical Constitutions are confirm'd by Common Practice, or grounded on it, the Obligation to an observance of them, or compliance with them, is the greater. If any Man seem to be Contentionous, says the Apostle, we have no such Custom, nor the Churches of God, 1 Cor. 11. 16. By which words he intimates, 1. That in things Indifferent, the Custom of the Churches is a Law, and by it they that are Peaceable will be governed. 2. They that dispute and act against such Customs are Men given to Contention, and what they do proceeds not from any due Respect for Truth.



Truth and Peace, nor is it, says Theophylact \*, the Work of Reason and a good Understanding, but of the Spirit of Strife. 3. To oppose the Custom of the Churches against their Arguings, is a sufficient Confutation of them.

WHEN I had consider'd the Practice of the Apostles with regard to External Rites, I shew'd you further, that they who succeeded the Apostles in their Office and Ministry, and flourish'd in some part of their time, or in the next Age after them, followed their Example; and as they kept up the Customs which had been introduced, so they added others when they thought it requisite.

BUT say you, *Who were those that succeeded the Apostles in their Office and Ministry? If you mean the Extraordinary Apostolical Office, you must prove that there were any that succeeded them in it, and that had that Power of Ordering and Governing the Churches, as they had.* That is, for your Satisfaction, I must prove a palpable Contradiction. If the Office of the Apostles was extraordinary, and limited to their Persons, they could have no Successors in it: But I have proved in another Treatise that they had Successors, and consequently their Office, as to the Substance of it, was not extraordinary,

F 2

how-

---

\* *φιλονεικίας ἀγατὴ καὶ ἀνιστάμεν ἐν τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς, ἀλλ' ἔστι λογισμὸς καὶ συνέσις.* Theophylact. in 1 Cor. 11. 16.

however in them, it was attended with several Circumstances that were peculiar to them, and died with them.

THE Presbyterians generally grant, That the Apostles had Successors in Preaching the Gospel, and the Administration of the Sacraments, and it is no less certain, that they had them also in Governing the Churches, and Regulating External Circumstances and Modes of Worship, as there was occasion, and that the Primitive Bishops herein exercised their Authority.

Let. 1. Pag. 24.

Pag. 28, 29.

YOU had formerly the Confidence to declare to the World, That no Ceremonies were imposed on the Primitive Christians; but this you know to be false, if we may now believe you. For when I had proved it to be so by many Instances, you now say, *To what end have you given your self all this trouble, to rake all this Old stuff together for me, who knew enough of it before, as well as you, and perhaps before you had any occasion of knowing it; unless it be to inform the World, how well the Apostles Successors have followed the Apostles Examples, and how prone the Nature of Man is to Superstition, and to deviate from the purest Rules of Institution, and by what Means and Methods Antichrist did rise to the height of Abomination. — By their adding and superadding this sort of Stuff, they at last filled the Church with that which set up the Whore of Babylon in all her Formalities, which is all the service Things of this kind were ever good for. And thus at one Dash have you*

con-

condemned all the Apostolick Churches, as well as those that flourished afterwards; for from this *sort of stuff*, as you call External Rites that are not of the Essence of Religion, not one of them, that we can find, was free.

I shew'd you, That the Governours of the Churches, who in the early Times of Christianity imposed on them certain Rites, did not leave it Indifferent to the People whether they would obey their Lawful Injunctions or not. And you now say, *That you* believe so too: For then their Imposing Power had been very insignificant, and utterly inconsistent with the Humour of an Imposing Spirit. At this Spirit you take great Offence; and finding that it was very early at work, you now say, *That in the Second Century and on-ward*, Superstitions of all kinds began to spring up apace in most of the Churches; nor was it hard to perswade the People, so newly recovered from their Heathenism, and Judaism, especially in those Days of Persecution, to an easy Compliance to the Superstitious Orders of their Church-Guides, to whom they had committed the Conduct, not only of their Souls, but of their Temporal Affairs too. Nor were they in their Infancy, so capable of judging of that Sacred Rule, by which they ought to be guided and govern'd: And the best of their Leaders themselves too ready to humour and oblige them with such Ecclesiastical Toys, as were apt to please Children: Not foreseeing or considering to what a height of Superstition and Abuse, these little Indulgences and small Beginnings would in

## Of the Unity of the Church.

time run. For thus was the Ground-work of the Antichristian Abomination laid, even in the Second and Third Ages, which are called the Purest Ages of the Church, but in many respects far enough from the Primitive Apostolical Simplicity.

IT is strange that even the Best of their Leaders should be for humouring the People with such Ecclesiastical Toys as are fit to please Children; and what increases the Wonder is that for this purpose, they should make choice of the time of Persecution. It is very strange that they should be so trifling when they were aspiring after the Crown of Martyrdom, and that they should be so much for Superstition when they were resisting it unto Blood. It is absurd to think, that they should degenerate from the Apostolical Simplicity, when, as I have proved, they were following the Apostolical Example, and that they should lay the Ground-work of Antichristian Abominations, who of all Men had them in the greatest Abhorrence. You see your Libel against them is very ill contrived, and has need of something else to support it besides your own Affirmations.

I cannot but observe how the Tables are turned since our last Conversation. For then you contended that Ceremonies were not exacted of the Primitive Christians, but now for the Credit of your Understanding, but at the Expence of your Sincerity, you tell me that you knew the contrary. You then

the  
spee  
you  
blas  
only  
pre  
the  
wou  
plea  
rath  
as M  
stic  
I do  
upon  
of th  
woul  
whic  
Injur  
all, is  
of the  
Impos  
land,  
Their  
in Re  
stice.  
Self in  
Cloud  
is come

YO  
sonabl  
Rites,  
Antich  
now th  
peared  
charge

then mentioned the Fathers with some respect, and speaking of their Care of Unity, you said; *That the Church had great reason to bless God for this their Zeal, and most Religiously to deserve them in it.* But now you represent the Best of them that flourished in the Purest Ages, as Men of Intrigue, that would corrupt Religion to serve a Turn, and please the People with Ecclesiastical Toys, rather than feed them with Sound Doctrine; as Men that were much addicted to Superstition, and great Factors for Antichrist. I do not think there is a Sincere Christian upon Earth, that knows the true Character of the Persons whom you thus describe, but would very much abhor the Reflections which you have made on them, as False and Injurious. But what is at the Bottom of all, is, you are convinced that even the Best of the Primitive Bishops, were as much for Imposing Ceremonies as the Church of England, and this you would not forgive them. Their Practice confutes your Opinions, and in Revenge you would Arraign their Practice. You have unhappily engaged your self in a Bad Cause, and would vilify that Cloud of Witnesses by whose Testimony it is condemned.

YOU first concluded from your Unreasonable Prejudices, that all Ecclesiastical Rites, which the Lord hath not required, are Antichristian Abominations; and finding now that the most Primitive Fathers appeared for some Things of that Nature, you charge them of Course with the Abominations.



tions. But in my Opinion, you began at the wrong End, and should have argu'd, that since the Best of Men who flourish'd in the Second as well as the following Centuries, and were instructed by the Apostles themselves, or their immediate Disciples; since these Men, that are to be reckoned amongst the greatest Examples of Piety and Vertue, of Mortification and Self-denial that ever the World knew, were for the use of some Indifferent Rites in the Publick Worship, it is manifest that these were no Abominations; but Lawful and fit to be enjoyn'd upon proper Occasions. They had far better Means of being inform'd of their Duty, and of the Practice of the Apostles and the Apostolick Churches, than we have or can have, at this distance. They had also that Zeal for the Truth, that they were ready to lay down their Lives for it. And therefore their Unanimous Consent and Example must be of great weight, in the Matters before us; and so it hath ever been esteem'd by the Churches.

Pag. 27. 31.

YOU tell me, how *Rationally*, how *School-like*, how *Learnedly*! I go about to prove a *Matter of Right by Matters of Fact*. As if no Matters of Fact could prove a Right! Whereas the Practice of the Churches in the Apostles Days and afterwards, which I have urg'd for Ceremonies, is a good Argument for the Observation of the First Day of the Week, and is used as such, not only by Conformists, but by the Presbyterians themselves. Amongst the rest, Mr.

G.

G. 7  
his  
Rest  
Con  
pur  
deck  
their  
wou  
ter i  
to hi  
confi  
Mat  
such  
there  
this  
Adva  
Cause  
there  
desire  
an A  
serve

IN  
if you  
Use of  
Practi  
rished  
ter the  
ent Pl  
I may  
lick A  
to mak  
nies, a  
were,



G. T. thought it worth his Pains to shew Lords Day his Adversary, the Tradition of the Lords-days Vind. P. 126. Rest, down along from the Apostles time, to the Conclusion of the fourth Century. And for this purpose he cites many of the Fathers, to declare what the Practice of the Church was in their several Ages; not doubting but this would be of great force to decide the matter in Controversy. And now you may say to him, if you please, You may at your leisure consider, how Learnedly you go about to prove a Matter of Right by Matters of Fact. Such and such things have been done in the Days of Tore; therefore it is Lawful and Just to do so still. At this Rate indeed you may set up for a Catholick Advocate in any place of the World, and in any Cause whatsoever, Right or Wrong; for what is there done that hath not been done before? I am desirous that your Friend would return you an Answer to this; and that, I suppose, may serve for my Vindication.

IN the mean time I must tell you, that if you can prove that an Argument for the Use of Indifferent Things, taken from the Practice of the Saints and Martyrs that flourished in the Second Century, and acted after the Example of the Apostles, is a sufficient Plea for any thing either Right or Wrong, I may return you the Complement of Catholick Advocate, since you are so well qualified to make Apologies for all manner of Villanies, and to justify all the Crimes that ever were, or shall be committed in the World.

We

WE have seen what Authority there is for Imposing Ceremonies : And there is the very same for making them Conditions of Communion. But that they are so with us, it is only by Accident, on the account of their being commanded, and not out of an Opinion of any Vertue ascribed to them : As in all Governments things that are Indifferent in their Nature, being enjoy'd, become necessary in their use. Thus the Matter of Human Laws is often Indifferent, but the Observance of them is not so ; for he that will be of a Society, must keep the Laws of it. Thus our Ecclesiastical Rites are declar'd to be Indifferent, but our Obedience to those that Rule over us, is grounded on an expresse Command of God, and is an Essential Part of our Christianity. The wilful Neglect of it therefore would exclude us from Heaven ; and if it also deprives us of the Communion of the Church on Earth, or cuts us off from the Body, we have no cause to complain of Tyrannical Impositions ; nor any thing else to condemn, but our own Perverseness.

Page 34.

THIS I said in my Vindication, and hath thrown you into one of your *loud Paroxysms*. The Fit being upon you, you cry out, *Here we have a Rare Specimen of your Divinity ; and that not only in measuring the Temple of God by the Kingdoms of the Earth, and Levelling Religion with Worldly Policy, and Conscience with Carnal Interest, as if Obedience in Matters of Religion were to be set at the*

same

same degree of Latitude with that of Worldly Governments, and that Mens Consciences ought to be as Brawny as their Shoulders: But in laying down this General and Unlimited Position; that in all Governments (Church-Government not excepted) things that are Indifferent in their Nature, being enjoyn'd, become Necessary in their Use. How long shall we hear these Vain Words? When will you be ashamed of this Refuge of Lies, where you always take Sanctuary, to the Reproach of the Christian Religion. Sir, how few are there of Actions or Things in the World, that are not in their own Nature, simply considered, Indifferent? What an Immensity of Power have you then ascrib'd to your Church-Rulers? And have I indeed ascrib'd such a Power to Church-Rulers, that they may impose any Things whatsoever that, in their own Natures simply considered, are Indifferent? You know the contrary. You know that I would not have any Ceremonies prescribed, but such as are agreeable to the General Rules of Scripture: And who it is then that is not ashamed to make Lies his Refuge, let others judge.

THE Scripture that commands us to be subject to Secular Powers, does also require us to obey those that are over us in the Lord: And I have only given the true Interpretation of this Precept. And is this measuring the Temple of God by the Kingdoms of the Earth? Is this Levelling Religion with Worldly Policy, and Conscience with Carnal Interest? Or are the Injunctions for Standing and Kneeling in the Church, upon proper

Occ

Occasions, such a heavy Burden, that you cannot submit to it, unless your *Conscience were as Brawny as your Shoulders*? If so I cannot help it, nor can I make another Scripture for you. As for that which we have, I am sure it no where says, That it is necessary for us to be Conformable to the Laws of our Country in Civil Affairs; but may reject at pleasure the Ecclesiastical Constitutions which are made by Authority, for the sake of Decency and Order. And you must excuse me, that I cannot allow you a Liberty, which God hath not granted; nor gratify you by making his Commandment of none Effect.

Page 34.

BUT say you, *Is not your Doctrine of Indifferent Things as true all the World over where ever any Human or Religious Laws are to be found, as it is in England?* Let me ask you seriously, Should all the Superstitious, yea Idolatrous Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Rome, or of any other People in the World that pretend to the Worship of a Deity, be required of you by the Rulers of your Church, as the Conditions of the Communion with them, must you not, by your own avowed Doctrine, think yourself bound to obey them. But what you would do in such a Case, I cannot tell. Nor do I know what your own Practice would be; but what it may be according to your Principles, it will not be hard to determine.

AS for my Doctrine about Indifferent Things, it is as true all over the World, as it is in *England*. It hath been received by all the Reformed Churches abroad, and asserted and defended by so many of their Learned Men, that I could fill whole Volumes with their Testimonies for it. It is grounded on the Example of the Apostles, and confirm'd by the Practice of their Successors in the Purest Ages. And now you may conclude against them all, if you please, that according to their Principles, they must have comply'd with all the Superstitious and Idolatrous Rites, that were used by any People in the World. This would be a very strange Censure upon them, but it is no other than the Result of your own Reasoning.

BUT supposing Idolatrous Rites were imposed on me by my Superiours, you demand how I would argue against them: Would you plead, say you Pag. 35. that you are not satisfied in the Lawfulness of their Commands, that it is gross Superstition or Idolatry that is required of you? Would they presently choak you with your own avow'd Doctrine, and tell you as you now tell us, That your Obedience to those that Rule over you is grounded on an Express Command of God, and is an Essential Part of your Christianity? And is this my avow'd Doctrine with which you would have them choak me? Or did I say, that to commit Idolatry at the Command of my Governours, is



is an Essential Part of my Christianity? Your own Conscience tells you that this is false. But what if the Imposers say farther, *The things required of you are in their own Natures Indifferent, and therefore being required, are become Necessary, in their Use?* Here I confess they would put me to a Nonplus, did I believe that Idolatrous Ceremonies are Indifferent Things, or were obliged to take their word for it. But I can be convinced of neither. But say you, *Will they not from your own Mouth tell you, that for you to plead the Priviledge of a Private Judgment, or the Sentiments and Perswasion of your own Conscience, is Disloyally, Schismatically, Proudly, and Puritanically to oppose your Private against the Publick Judgment of the Church?* Sir, is not this Hobbean Divinity which you are now Preaching to us? Sir, 'tis your own Preaching, and of your own Invention, and you may call it what you please. When you are got into your Sanctuary, you take the Liberty to impute any thing to me, in open Defiance of Truth and Modesty.

PERHAPS you say, I will tell you *There is no Idolatry nor Superstition in the things required of us; But will not Rome and Constantinople, and all the Religionists in the World, tell you the same? And will you take it so upon their word? No, by no means.* I am not willing to take their word, nor do expect that they should take mine; but let the best Reason de-

cide  
ver  
had  
wo

B  
Chr  
Wor  
Self  
in i  
selve  
with  
ry a  
ed,  
Judge  
of E  
rece  
falle  
you  
of a  
fore,  
then  
re's  
in th

I  
judge  
that  
they  
Boun  
brou  
par D  
nefs.  
rectio

cide



side the Matter. And I should think it very strange, if the Church of England had no more to say for her self than the worst Religionists in the World.

BUT say you farther, *Is not every Church Orthodox in Doctrine, and Pure in Worship to it self?* It is, or it must be Self-condemn'd, but I am not concerned in it. *Who are they that will own themselves Hereticks or Idolaters?* I have met with none, nor need I make any Enquiry about them. You take it for granted, that I must approve of the *Publick Judgment*, as you call it, of the Church of England without any Examination, and receive her Testimony for her self as Infallible. But for this I have not given you the least Ground; nor had you need of any. Your way, as we have seen before, is to feign Opinions for me, and then to argue against them, or start Quæres upon them, as if they had something in them of Reality.

I never denied the People a Liberty to judge for themselves, but it is a Liberty that they may easily abuse: A Liberty that they ought to restrain within its proper Bounds. Otherwise, they may soon be brought to call Evil Good, and Good Evil; to put Darkness for Light, and Light for Darkness. To prevent which, the following Directions may be of use to them.

I. THEY

1. THEY ought to condemn nothing as Sinful, but what is either directly or by Consequence forbidden by a Divine Precept. This you have granted; and the Thing itself is evident: For *S. John* says, *That sin is transgression of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. And *S. Paul* tells us, *That where there is no Law, there is no Transgression*, Rom. 4. 15. It follows, that they who oppose our Ceremonies as Sinful, ought to shew us where they are condemned in Scripture.

2. IT may be very sinful to command some Ceremonies, when it may be the Subjects Duty to use them when they are commanded. These are the words of *Mr. Baxter* \*, who thus confirms his Proposition. " If a Pastor call the Assembly at an Inconvenient Hour, or to an Inconvenient Place, though it be his Sin to do so, yet it is their Duty to Obey. If in the manner of Prayer he (tolerably) miscarry, they may not therefore refuse to joyn with him. If of two Translations of Scripture, or two Versions of the Psalms, he chuse the worse (so it be tolerable) they must obey. ——— The Reasons of this are obvious and clear: Even because it is the Office of the Governours to determine of such Circumstances. It is the Pastors Office to guide and over-see the Flock. And so the determining of Time and Place

---

\* *Baxter*. Disput. of Church-Government, Pag. 460.

" Place of Worship belongeth to his Office :  
" And the choice of the Versions, Transla-  
" tions, and other Ordinary Helps, are his  
" Work. And therefore when he deter-  
" mineth these, he is but in his own Way,  
" and doth but his own Work. And there-  
" fore he is therein the Judge, if the Case  
" be Controvertible. If none shall obey a  
" Magistrate or Pastor in the Works of  
" their own Office, as long as they think he  
" did them not the best way, all Govern-  
" ment would then be presently overthrown,  
" and Obedience deny'd. We are sure that  
" God hath commanded us to Obey them  
" that are over us in the Lord : And there-  
" fore a Certain Duty may not be forborn  
" upon Uncertain Conjectures, or upon e-  
" very Miscarriage in them that we owe it  
" to. This would Unchurch all Churches  
" (as they are Political Societies) : For if  
" Pastors and their Work be taken down,  
" the Church is taken down. And if the  
" Government and Obedience be taken  
" down, then Pastors and their Work are  
" taken down ; which would be the Fruit  
" of this Disorder.

3. WHERE Obedience to Authority is  
a Duty, there the with-drawing that Obe-  
dience, and acting against that Authority,  
must be a Sin : And it does not cease to be  
so when Men fall into it by Mistake. Their  
Mistake does not free them from Guilt, but  
leaves them as liable to Punishment, as are  
the Imposers of Sinful Things. Ignorance  
perhaps may be pleaded for both, but can  
G justify

justify neither, nor indeed excuse them, if they might have had Information, but rejected or refused it.

*Ubi Supra,*  
P. 483.

Mr. Baxter says: " If through Weakness  
" or Perverseness we take Lawful Things  
" to be Unlawful, that will not excuse us  
" in our Disobedience. Our Error is our  
" Sin, and one Sin will not excuse ano-  
" ther.

4. WHEN Private Persons are dissatisfied with Things enjoyn'd by Authority, they ought to get the best Information that is possible, before they reject and oppose them. They that will set up their own Private Judgment against the Publick, should be well assured that they do it upon good Grounds, and not meerly on Doubts and Suspensions. It is no small Matter to revolt from a Lawful Government, and to disturb the Peace of the Church: And before any be engaged in such a Work, they should impartially weigh the Matters in Controversy, and endeavour, to the utmost of their Power, to see them in the clearest Light.

5. AMONGST other Means of Information, before they desert their Pastors established by Authority, they ought to consult them, and fairly hear, and attentively consider, what they can say in Defence of their Constitution. But they who with us fell into the Separation, were so far from this, that they hated, and persecuted with

with their Tongues, the Episcopal Ministers who had deserved well of them; and against whom they had no other Exception, but their Endeavours to set them right. They esteemed those their greatest Enemies who *told them the Truth*, and they treated them accordingly. And in this Work they were mightily encouraged by some, who having made but little Enquiry into the Merits of the Cause, would be writing Books for them, that serve for no other purpose but to feed their ill Humours, and furnish them with all the Topicks of Railing.

---

## SECT. II.

*Of the Separation of the Dissenters from the Church of England.*

**H**AVING Vindicated what I said of the Unity of the Church, I shall proceed to do the same on the Subject of *Schism*. But for the better understanding of things wherein we differ, I shall, according to my former Method, set down some things here wherein we are agreed, because this may help us to a true State of the Question between us, and set the chief Matters in Controversy in a better Light.

1. WE are agreed that *Schism*, in the Notion of it which we are upon, or as it relates to the Debates between the *Conformists* and *Dissenters*, is a Causeless Breach of Ecclesiastical Communion.

2. THAT the Breach is Causeless, which might be avoided without Sin.

3. THAT there is such a Breach between the Church of *England* and the *Dissenters*.

AND so the Pretence that they are all One must be out of doors.

THE



THE Question then is, *Who are the Schismatics? The Church of England, or the Dissenters, who have made a Separation from her?* You affirm it of the one, and I of the other. And with what Right we have done the one or the other, is now to be consider'd.

I. I shall consider your Charge against the Church of England. 'Tis too Notorious, say you Pag. 180, to be deny'd, that the Imposition of Unnecessary and Offensive Rites and Ceremonies of Human Invention, is the true Cause of our Divisions. — When should we have fallen out about Ceremonies, had they, as Indifferent Things, been left to be used Indifferently, or refused, as every one is satisfy'd in his Mind about them? But you might as well have told me, That good Laws are the cause of the Breach of them, by such as are pleased to call them Unnecessary and Offensive, for if there had been no such Laws, there could have been no Disobedience to them. And thus Government is the Cause of Rebellion; for there could have been no Rebellion, had there been nothing but Anarchy from the Beginning.

WHAT was the true Cause of the Schism, may best be seen if we trace the Matter to the Original; for which Purpose we need no other Assistance but Baylie's *Disswasve from the Errors of the Time*: A Book doubtless of good Authority with you, and out of it you may take the following Account.

" THE first Separatist I read of, (says  
 " Baylie, *Dissuas.* p. 13.) was one *Ralston* :  
 " A Man of whom his Followers can have  
 " small Credit. For the Finger of God's  
 " Justice stirring in his Conscience, made  
 " the Sense of his Errors so grievous to his  
 " Soul, that he not only recanted them  
 " publicly at *Paul's-Cross*, but afterwards  
 " was so dogged with a desperate Remorse,  
 " that he rested not, 'till by Hanging him-  
 " self he ended his Miserable Days.

" THE Horror of this Remarkable  
 " Vengeance did not deter *Robert Brown*  
 " from taking up the Banner of Separation,  
 " which God wrung out of the Hands of  
 " miserable *Bolton* : But that Cause did  
 " thrive no better with him than with his  
 " Predecessor. When this rash Young Man  
 " had gathered a Separate Congregation,  
 " and drawn up for the Defence of his Way  
 " those Writings, whence ever since the  
 " best Arguments for the Schism are drawn,  
 " they went over to enjoy their Liberty at  
 " *Middleburgh* in *Zealand*. But behold the  
 " Wrath of God following them at the  
 " Heels ; when there was no Disturbance  
 " from without, they fell to such jarring  
 " amongst themselves, that they soon brake  
 " all to pieces : The most turn'd Anabap-  
 " tists : *Brown* himself return'd into *Eng-*  
 " *land*, recanted his *Brownism*, and recei-  
 " ved a Parsonage at the hand of a Bishop.  
 " The course of his Life, to his deep Old  
 " Age, was so extreemly Scandalous, that  
 " more

" more than Ordinary Charity is needful to  
 " perswade us that ever he was led by a  
 " good Spirit.

" THE third Master of this Sect was  
 " *Barrow*, the most bitter and clamorous  
 " Censurer of all the Reformed Churches of  
 " any that hath yet put Pen to Paper;  
 " chuse whom ye will of the most Despite-  
 " ful *Jesuites*. Let their Books, which are  
 " most besprinkled with Gall, be compar'd  
 " with *Barrow's* Discovery; this to my  
 " Taste is no sweeter than the bitterest of  
 " them all. And yet there is small Reason  
 " why, with so great Arrogance, he should  
 " have taken into his hand the Censor's  
 " Rod, if all be true of him which his Op-  
 " posites object. However, before he could  
 " gather any formed Congregation, his In-  
 " vectives against the Faith, Baptism and  
 " Laws of *England* were so excessive, that  
 " Queen *Elizabeth*, impatient of his Con-  
 " tumelies, caused him to be Hang'd on the  
 " *Tower-Hill*.

" THE fourth Leader of this Way was  
 " Mr. *Johnson*, who affraid at *Barrow's* Exe-  
 " cution, got over with the Church he had  
 " gathered to *Amsterdam*, and there for  
 " many Years was Pastor to the first Settled  
 " Congregation of *Brownists* we read of.  
 " This Man with *Ainsworth* his Doctor, sent  
 " out to all the Reformed Churches the Con-  
 " fession of their Faith, in the Year 1602.  
 " But long it was not till it appear'd to the  
 " World that no better Spirit did reign in

*Of the Separation of the Dissenters*

“ that Company than in the former Societies of this Way. For Three Shameful Schisms, one upon the Neck of another, brake out amongst them.

“ First, Many of them turn’d *Anabaptists*, and were Excommunicated.

“ Secondly, Mr. *Johnson* fell to so great Odds, first with his Brother *George* for small Matters, and afterwards with his Father, that he Excommunicated them both, and was cursed by both, when he had rejected peremptorily the Mediation of the Presbytery of *Amsterdam* for Reconciliation.

“ Thirdly, The Remnant of the Company, a little after rent in two, upon needless Questions, Mr. *Ainsworth* the Doctor and his half, did Excommunicate *Johnson* and his half; who were not long behind, for they also did quickly Excommunicate *Ainsworth* and all his Followers.

*Baylie* hath much more to the same purpose: After which he speaks of the *Independents*, and makes them the *Genuine Off-spring* of the *Brownists*, because, as he says, *The thing is demonstrable, not only by the Consanguinity of their Tenents, the one having borrowed all the chief Doctrines and Practices from the other, but also by Deduction of their Pedigree in a clear Line.* And this he sets down in due Order.

Ibid. P. 54.

SOME

SOME Pages afterwards he adds, Pag. 58, 59.

That notwithstanding Independency was brought to the utmost Pitch of Perfection, which the Wit and Industry of its best Patrons were able to attain; notwithstanding it had the Advantage of the Brownists Fatal Miscarriages, to be Exemplary Documents of Wisdom; and was also assisted and fenced with all the Security that Civil Laws of its Friends own framing, and Gracious Magistrates at their Absolute Devotion could afford; yet in a very few, in less than one Week of Years, it had flown into more shameful Absurdities, than the Brownists in their Fifty Years Tryal had stumbled upon.

AND on the Occasion of this History of them, we may make the following

### REFLECTIONS.

1. THE Church of England did not first separate from the Dissenters, but the Dissenters from the Church. They continu'd many Years in her Communion, after the Beginning of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. And we are agreed, That if their Breach of that Communion was Causeless, we must lodge the Guilt of Schism at their door.

2. THEIR Separation was Causeless, in Judgment of the Presbyterians, who were not like to be partial on the side of Conformity.

You

You see how Baylie condemns them for it; and many of his Brethren had no better Opinion of it.

Mr. Baxter says \*, *The Old Nonconformists who wrote against it, were neither Blind nor Temporizers. They saw the Danger on that side. Even Brightman on the Revelations, that writeth against the Prelacy and Ceremonies, Severely reprehendeth the Separatists. Read but the Writings of Mr. John Paget, Mr. John Ball, Mr. Hildersham, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Baine, Mr. Rathband, and many such others, against the Separatists of those Times, and you may learn that our Light is not greater, but less than theirs; and that we see not further into that Cause than they did; and that Change of Times doth not Change the Truth, nor will it warrant us to Change our Religion, unless we will make our Religion subject to the Wills and Interests of Men, and change it as oft as the Times shall change.*

3. THE Schism did proceed from a Spirit of Error and Giddiness, from a Spirit of Pride and Arrogance in the Separatists themselves. And this put them upon opposing and rejecting things that were certainly useful, and so esteemed by the Presbyterians.

THEY

---

\* See his Preface before his Cure of Church Divisions.



THEY were for pulling down the Churches \* that were built before the Reformation, and levelling them with the Ground as Monuments of Idolatry, and for breaking their Bells as Popish Inventions. They rejected Catechisms, as Set and Unlawful Forms of Instruction. *Psalms* in Meter † they held in the same Rank with pleasant Ballads; and all Songs out of a Book ‡ they condemned as Idolatrous, and the Inventions of the Man of Sin. You see how far they pursu'd your Principles, that things Abused ought to be abolish'd or destroy'd, as the Brazen Serpent was by *Hezekiah*, and that in the Matter of Religion nothing ought to be required that the Lord hath not required.

AND now you may tell us. if you please, that nothing ought to be impos'd, that to Men of this Temper appears Doubtful or Sinful: Nothing that with them is an Offensive Vanity.

4. ACCORDING to their Principles they must have Separated from all the Reformed Churches, as well as our own.

AND

\* See the *Brownists* Confur. p. 39. Barr. Disc. p. 133.

† Barrow. Refur. p. 43.

‡ Smith's Differ. p. 4.

Baylfe's Diff.  
p. 21, 36.

AND accordingly " They condemned those that had not Bishops as well as the rest, and pronounced their Worship to be Idolatrous, their Government Antichristian, and their Constitution, both in Matter and Form, so Vicious, that they could not communicate with them with a good Conscience. *And this Detestable Stuff*, they said, issued from the Unhappy *Calvin*, who made use of it in his Ignorance to defend his Disorderly Proceedings at *Geneva*.

Gangr. Pag.  
18, &c.

5. THE Act of Uniformity was so far from being the Cause of the Schism, that it was a Means of putting Restraint upon it. And manifest it is, that when the Separatists were got out of the Reach of that Statute, and gather'd their Congregations in Foreign Parts, they grew worse and worse : and when the Force of it was taken away in our own Nation, and the Impositions were over, the Divisions were so far from being thereby cur'd, that they were mightily Improv'd. And such were the Effects of them, that Mr. *Edwards*, a Zealous Nonconformist, hath given us an account of a vast number of *Errors, Heresies, and Blasphemies, and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries, vented and acted in England, in the space of Four Years*. On the Account of which the *Scots* themselves cry'd out \*, *that no*

---

\* See their Papers Published by Authority. A. D. 1643.

Man could be so destitute of Sense and Reason, as to think such an Anarchy and Confusion, as now prevails over the Churches of this Kingdom, to be the Ordinance of God. No Christian can be so void of Knowledge and Faith, as to imagine such a Monstrous Deformity to be the Beauty and Glory of the Kingdom of Christ on Earth.

THE Presbyterians lead the Way to all this, by Despising Authority and Preferring their own groundless Opinions before the Judgment of the Universal Church: by Opposing our Ceremonies and the Episcopal Government, as Antichristian Abominations, and Magnifying their own Discipline as the Scepter of Christ. And the Brownists and Independents that came after them, did but refine upon their Principles, and put their Speculations in Execution. And thus Sects sprang out of Sects, and multiplied so prodigiously, that the like was never known in any Age or Country.

HOWEVER, it must be Acknowledged, that the True Presbyterians did all along, with great Zeal, Oppose the Separation; and yet for this you contend with great Vehemence, They Pleaded much for Lay-Conformity, and you Eagerly against it. So that I cannot but say to your self, and the Men of your way, that you have assum'd the Title of Presbyterians, whilst you have abandon'd a very Material Principle, that distinguish'd them from other Sects; and having done this, you should have answer'd the *Pagers and Balls*, the *Hil-der-shams*

dershams and Bradshaws, the Baines and the Rathbands, before you came to make your Attempts upon the Church of England.

II. HAVING Examined your Charge against the Church; I am to consider your Defensive Part, in which you would Vindicate the Dissenters from the Imputation of Schism. But in order to it, it may be fit to put you in mind, once more, of some of your Concessions.

1. YOU granted that the Church of England is a True Church of Christ, in which Salvation is to be Obtain'd. And you added, what is very Just, that if you had not been so Persuaded, you had been Self-condemn'd by your own Practice.

2. YOU granted, that it is Lawful to Communicate with the Church of England: but you say, I should have added, *that it is not absolutely or in it self Sinful so to do.* And be it so, for I am not willing to extort more from you than you are willing to yield. Nor do I doubt, but that, if you would abide by it, would put an end to the Dispute.

3. YOU granted, that you not only thought that Lay-Conformity was Lawful, but that it was your Duty; that is, as you Explain your self, when you could have no better; and you added, that you had not Repented of these Thoughts to this Day. But whether, as you say, you have not Acted

Acted any thing that is Inconsistent with them, is a thing in Debate, which ought not to disturb us at present, when we are upon Terms of Accommodation.

4. YOU granted, that the Act of Indulgence hath not alter'd the Case, as to the Nature of the Thing, in Dispute between us. And you Confess, *that had you no better Reasons than the Liberty which the Law hath given, you should think your selves in a sad Case.* It follows, that there is nothing in this Law can hinder, but that, if Separation be your Duty now, it was so before: if Conformity was your Duty before, it so remains.

5. YOU granted more than I demanded, and gave more than I could receive. You contend that it is still the Bounden Duty of your Brethren, remaining such, to Communicate with us, if it be to qualifie them for an Office. You are Offended, it seems, that I did not Express this in softer Terms, and therefore take it in your own. Pag. 38.  
*It is every Man's Bounden Duty, you say, to serve God and his Country; as also to provide for himself and his Family, with all those Intellectual and Corporeal Abilities, wherewith God hath Blest him, accordingly as there are Occasions and Calls to it: Therefore nothing that is Tolerable, and not plainly Sinful, tho' Burdensome and Uneligible, ought to restrain us from the Service of God or Man, which we are fitted for and call'd to.* For as you said in your former Letter, *Who knows of what Consequence* See p. 6.  
the



*Of the Separation of the Dissenters.*

*the Service of such may be, especially in a Publick Post, to the Preservation of Religion and Property, or to the Support and the Establishment of the Government?* But whether it be that you are now Convinced, that your Brethren have not been so Eminent in Publick Posts, for the *Preservation of Religion and Liberty*, or whatsoever Reason you had, you have now Omitted this Expostulation, when you pretend to give a full Recital of your own Words. But the meaning of the whole agrees with my Representation of it, and it is, that however Dissenters, who are Stated Separatists, esteem it Burdensom to joyn with us in our Publick Worship, yet they ought to Communicate with us, even at the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that upon their Knees; when they are call'd to a *Publick Post*, or when it is in Order to the Exercise of their *Intellectual or Corporeal Abilities*, in Places of Honour and Advantage; by which they may Provide for Themselves and Families, and Promote such other Noble Ends as you have mention'd.

BEFORE I proceed any farther, I would make a Proposal to you, which, I hope, will not be thought Unreasonable: It is, that it be admitted as an Article of Accommodation between us, that as, in your Opinion, it is not sufficient that a thing be *Burdensom* and *Uneligible*, nor yet that it be Doubtful; it must be *Plainly Sinful*, that excludes those Dissenters from Pre-ferment, who are of Capacity for it, and of  
your



your Judgment in the matter : So nothing less than what may keep them from Preferment, nothing but what is plainly Sinful, should hinder them from returning to the Unity of the Church. I only demand, that they would do as much constantly for the Love of Christ, who earnestly desired and pray'd, *That all that believe in him may be* *John 17. 22.* One ; as they do Occasionally for Money : That they would do That for the Sake and Benefit of his Mystical Body, which they do for their own Profit, and the Advancement of their own Families : That they would do That for Peace, which they do for an Office. And if they would but grant me this, our Controversy would be over, and all would end in a happy Agreement.

THESE things being premised, the Question before us is, *Whether the Separation of the Dissenters from the Church of England be nor Causeless?* And this may seem easy to be resolv'd from your own Concessions. But in Defiance of them you argu'd *See my Vind.* in your former Letter, That Separation is *Pag. 44.* your *Bounden Duty* : That now to Conform, would be to *sin against your own Souls*, and to *hazard the Loss of your Eternal All.*

YOU pleaded, That if you could have enjoy'd those Gospel Privileges with us, which our dearest Saviour purchas'd for you by his Precious Blood, and by his Last Will and Testament bequeathed to you, you had never forsaken us.

H

YOU

YOU pretended, That as the Case stands, you cannot worship God with us without Sin: That if we had Cause to forsake the Church of Rome, you have the same for departing from the Church of England: That if the Call to come out of Babylon, and not to partake of her Sins, justifies us, it does the same for you. And if we suppose that the Sins of the Papists are greater than the Sins of the Conformists, yet what is Sin, you said, is Sin at all times, the avoiding of which is a sufficient Reason for your Separation.

ALL this laid together, with what went before, looks very oddly; and I therefore demanded of you, How it comes to pass that our Ceremonies, which, you say, are the only Matters in debate, should be so Harmless at one time, and at another of so Malignant and Pernicious a Quality? How it is, that Sin is Sin at all times, and yet no Sin when you have occasion to use it? How is it, that Conformity should be Lawful when it is for your Interest, and so Harmous when it is otherwise; that one Day you are for it, and another you cannot comply with it without hazarding your Eternal All? How is it that you have a Call from Heaven to come out of *Babylon*, and yet have a Call from Heaven to continue in *Babylon*; or return to it when it is for your Ease and Profit; when it may advance you to Places of Honour or Advantage?

TO this you Answer, That I am fallen into a *Raving Delirium* and a *Phrenzy*, and could you be so happy, you say, to Page 40. relieve me, there might be some hope of reducing me to a better degree of Sobriety.

BUT you must excuse me, Sir, that having no Extraordinary Opinion of your Skill, I am not inclin'd to submit my self to your Prescriptions: I rather chuse to borrow one of your Familiar Expressions, and tell you, That if you had not been very sore, you would never have winced at this Rate. I now understand you so well, that when I find you treating me in this manner, I presently conclude, before I review my Papers, that you are in Distress. If that was not the Case here, why did you not produce my words which I have now repeated, and which you make an Argument of *Phrenzy*? Doubtless it was because they would have expos'd to open view something else than *Phrenzy*; something that touch'd you very nearly, and mov'd your Tender Bile. They would have discover'd even to your most Partial Readers into what Difficulties you were thrown, and how miserably you were intangled, by your own Rashness. Your Business was therefore to slide away from them, and make your Escape in the dark.

YOU pretend, That my *Quare's* were Page 40.

not worth repeating: But the Sum of them,

you say, is this, *How the same thing that*

## Of the Separation of the Dissenters

is Sinful at one time, and under some Circumstances, can possibly be Lawful, much less a Duty at another time, and under other Circumstances; & vice versa. And this you tell me is the Paradox which I cannot understand. No Sir, nothing of that, but a Falsification which I cannot approve. You had reason then to leave out my words, since you were resolv'd to give such an Interpretation of them; for you could not safely trust them together: To such dissingenuous Shifts are you driven, rather than you will recant the vilest Absurdities.

I never in the least doubted but Things Indifferent might, by Accident, or according to their various Circumstances, become Good or Evil, Duties or Offences: And therefore This could be no Paradox to me, nor is it to any Man of common Sense. My Business was to shew, That if your Objections against our Communion were of any force, they would prove it to be always Sinful: And I therefore confronted them with your Practice, and your Assertions in Favour of that Practice, which require, that the same Communion should be sometimes Lawful, and sometimes a Duty.

THESE things stand in a direct Opposition to one another, and their Combate made you so uneasy, that for bringing them together, I must be fallen into a Phrenzy or Raving Delirium.

SIR,

SIR, You can never be at a Loss for Answers, if this may pass for one: You may have continual Supplies out of your Rich Stores of Railing and Scurrility, which can never fail of furnishing you with *Cordials for your Cholerick Patients*, or with such Materials as, when you are closely pursu'd, may serve for Amusement.

BUT not to let the matter pass so easily, I shall resume the Instances already given, and I doubt not but upon our Review of them, it will appear, that they will not admit of your Evasions, but make it evident beyond all Exception, that your Pleas for your *Occasional Communion*, and your *Stated Separation*, as you call it, are Destructive of one Author, and that in respect of both you are Self-condemn'd.

YOU say, you could not continue in our Communion, *without hazarding the Loss of your Eternal All. You could not Enjoy with us the Gospel Priviledges, which our Dearest Saviour Purchas'd for you with his Blood.* And if so; certainly it cannot be a thing Indifferent, a thing with which you may Comply *Occasionally*, that would throw you into so much Danger, and deprive you of the greatest of all Blessings. Yet so it is, that when you are in view of a *Publick Post*, you are content, for a time, to part with those Glorious Advantages, which are wanting in our Churches, and think that you have a



## Of the Separation of the Dissenters

good Equivalent for them in good Preferment.

AGAIN you Plead, that if we had Cause to forsake the Church of Rome, you had the same for Departing from the Church of England: and if the Call, to come out of Babylon, justifies us, it doth the same for you. And if so, you must either affirm, that the Church of England imposes on you the Belief and Profession of False Doctrines, and also the Practice of Idolatry, or that Rome and Babylon do not. And then if you have the same Cause of Separation from us, as from them; you have the same Reason for joining with them *Occasionally* in their Worship, as with us, in ours. And so you may as well, *Occasionally* go to Mass, and bow the Knee before an Idol, as partake of our Communion, if it agrees with your Representation of it.

YOU say, that with us you cannot Worship God without Sin, and speaking of the same thing, you tell me, that what is Sin is Sin still. And the plain Consequence of this must be, that Conformity is always Sinful, and can never be Indifferent. I know not what Evasion you can have here, or how you will Defend your *Occasional* Communion with us, unless you will Declare, that you may commit Sin upon Occasion: Especially if it be in order to an Office wherein you may Exercise your Intellectual and Corporal Abilities. This is a Reason that is with you of great Weight, for who knows,

you



you say, of what Consequence the Service of such a one may be, to the Preservation of Religion and Property, or to the Support and Establishment of the Government?

TO deal plainly with you, I think, according to your Loose Principles, you may be in Profession, an Occasional Jew, or an Occasional Mohometan or Pagan, and Occasionally joyn in the several ways of Worship, in the Synagogue, in the Mosch, and in the Temple of Idols. You may turn your self into any Shape, and no Knot will be able to hold you fast. For if the Fear of Sin cannot Restrain you, I know not what else should Hinder you from being of any Religion, or of None, as your Occasions may require.

BUT I have not yet done, nor must the Charge which you have drawn upon your self end here. You say, *It is most Evident* Page 118.

*by all the Writings of the Apostles, that there is nothing in the World more contrary to that Spirit by which the Apostles were guided, and that wherein they walked with the Churches, than what we now call Conformity.* Again, Page 139.

you say, *It is Evident that there is nothing in the World to which the Apostle Paul was more adverse, than those things which I am so Excessively Fond of; meaning the Ceremonies.* Now false these Assertions are may be gathered from what went before. And what I am now to tell you is, that if nothing in the World was more contrary to the Apostolick Spirit than Conformity, nothing in the World

can be worse. If there was nothing to which *Paul* was more *averse* than the Ceremonies, then there is no Impiety, no Wickedness whatsoever that can be more Detestable. And from hence it follows, that if, notwithstanding this, you may joyn *Occasionally* in our Publick Worship, you may, according to your Principle, commit *Occasional* Perjuries and Murders, or any Crimes whatsoever. These are sad Reflections, but they are such as Unavoidably return upon you from the *Glass of your own Argumentations*. And methinks, it should Discompose you a little, when you see into what Extravagances your Passion has betray'd you.

YOU had Two things in View, which, as we have seen before, were very Inconsistent, and your Endeavour to Reconcile them hath set you at Perpetual War with your self, and fill'd your Book with Self-contradictions. The one was, to Justify your Conformity before the Act of Indulgence, as also your *Occasional* Communion with us since, and for this Purpose a favourable Coustruction was to be put upon the Rites of the Church; and the other was to Defend your present Separation, and for this Reason, the same things were to be Represented as Grievous Enormities. From hence it is, that with you, our Ceremonies are sometimes not only Innocent but Improv'd into Duties; at another they are *Antichristian Abominations*. When they are a Means of Providing for your Self and Fa-

mily,  
when  
canno  
your c  
rily be  
Sir he  
is Cor  
proac

BU  
demon  
Conde  
differ  
Script  
go far  
going  
for wh  
not go  
Progre  
to touc  
with u  
They  
es too  
votion  
Post.

to your  
Scriptu

YOU  
Carcass  
the Alt  
which c  
lla. 65.  
1. 13.  
upon O  
ay time

mi

to  
ere-  
ick-  
ete-  
that  
Oc-  
may,  
Occa-  
imes  
ions,  
return  
Argu-  
Dis-  
into  
s be-  
hich,  
confi-  
ncile  
with  
Self-  
ustifie  
indul-  
union  
your-  
n the  
was to  
d for  
e Re-  
From  
monies  
t Im-  
ey are  
ey are  
nd Fa-  
mily

mily, you may, and ought to use them: but when no Profit is to be got by them, you cannot *Defile the Worship of God*, and *Wound your Conscience* with such things as, you *verily believe, he hath Condemn'd*. You may see, Page 117.  
Sir how you are Divided, and how all that is Conformist in you, is Affronted and Re-  
proach'd by the Sectary.

BUT where is it that God hath Con-  
demn'd our Ceremonies? Or if he hath  
Condemn'd them, how came they to be In-  
different? You produce several Passages of  
Scripture, which, you are apt to think, will Lat. 1. p. 77.  
go far to Condemn them. But since their  
going far was not sufficient to do the Work,  
for which you summond them, why did they  
not go on to finish it? or what hindred their  
Progress? Why, they must not be suffer'd  
to touch the Dissenter who Communicates  
with us upon his Knees at the Sacrament:  
They must not make their Approaches  
too near him, or disturb his De-  
votion, when he is Aiming at a *Publick*  
*Post*. And here you shew a Tender Regard  
to your Dissenter, but none to the Holy  
Scriptures.

YOU compare our Ceremonies to *Dead*  
*Carcasses*, that are fitter for the Grave than Page 50.  
*the Altar*: and Represent them as Things  
which God himself calls a *Smoak in his Nose*,  
*Isa. 65. 5. and an Abomination to him*. Chap.  
1. 13. But may you offer him that *Smoak*  
upon *Occasion*, and will you serve him at a-  
ny time with *Abomination*? You are very  
un-

## Of the Separation of the Dissenters

Unhappy in your Inferences from Scripture, that prove more than you would have, or nothing to your purpose. Unless they are sometimes True, and sometimes False: Unless they are sometimes to be Received as Oracles, sometimes to be Rejected as Erroneous; they cannot serve your Turn, or be Consistent with your different Practices of Conformity and Separation. Take them which way you please, I think they go a great way to Prove, that you have egregiously Prevaricated both with God and Man. Of this I Admonish'd you in my Vindication: but you would take no Warning.

THAT you have wrested the Words which you have cited from *Isa. 65. 6.* will be farther Manifest, if it be consider'd, that when the Almighty says; *These are a Smoke in my Nose,* He speaks not of things, not of Lawful Ceremonies; but of Wicked Men, Men that did eat Swines Flesh, *V. 4.* and, as it may be gather'd from thence, abhorred the *Mosaic Rites*. Yet had they such an Opinion of their Sanctity, and were so Assuring and Arrogant, that the Speech amongst them, was, *come not near me, for I am Holier than thou.* And now to whom their Character best agrees, others may Determine.

YOUR other Quotation, which you have taken from *Isa. 1. 13.* is very Imperfect, and was only drawn in for the sake of the Word *Abomination*, which you would apply, as you think fit, without any other

Author

author  
verse r  
are va  
an up  
be Call  
is this  
these la  
icus de  
Ami A  
ndure  
ain fro  
regatio

THI  
d, and  
lowere  
id not  
ew Mo  
the A  
s if the  
efore fo  
ch Mar  
anied w  
anners  
itted b  
ut woul  
ould th  
dro do  
pollute  
ave grac

\* Non  
m. ....  
eu in loc  
t See V

authority than your own: The whole Verse runs thus in our Translation, *Bring no more vain Oblations; Incense is an Abomination unto me; the New Moons and the Sabbaths, the Calling of Assemblies I cannot away with: it is Iniquity, even the Solemn Meeting.* But these last words are thus rendered by *Ludovicus de Dieu* \*, *I cannot bear Iniquity and a Solemn Meeting.* As if he had said, I cannot endure these things together; either abstain from your Iniquity, or from the Congregation.

THIS Criticism seems to be well grounded, and may give you light into the Text. However, it is certain, that the Almighty did not reject the Oblations and Incense, the New Moons and the Sabbaths, the Calling of the Assemblies, and the Solemn Meetings, as if they had been Evil in themselves, or therefore forbidden by him; for there was no such Matter: But because they were accompanied with an Universal Corruption of Manners, and many horrible Crimes committed by the Princes and the People. But would they have Reform'd their Lives, would they have ceased to do Evil, and learned to do Well, the Rites which he condemn'd as polluted by their Wickedness, he would have graciously accepted as Expressions of their

---

\* Non possum ferre Iniquitatem & Solennem Congregationem. ----- Iniquitatem & Coetum ferre simul nequit. Lud. de Deu in loc.  
† See V. 4, 6, 15, 21, 22, 23.



their Obedience : He had done so before \* and so he would have done again.

NOR could it be otherwise, for the Things which he refused to receive from them, are the very same that he had made part of their Religion, and commanded by his Laws that were then in force. It's plain that this Instance makes nothing at all against our Ceremonies. But every one, you say P. 14. *would fain make the Scripture speak his own Sentiments, and some would familiarly make a Nose of Wax of it.* And of this you have here made the Experiment.

YOU were upon this very Work, when you argu'd, *That our Ecclesiastical Rites are against the Gospel Simplicity* ; and you manag'd it with the usual Disadvantage to your Cause. For if they were inconsistent with that *Simplicity*, the Dissenters would act against it in their *Occasional Communion* ; and unless you have got an *Indulgence* for them, your own Objection may be retorted upon them, and you have as much reason to answer it as my self.

BUT not to insist meerly upon this, demanded, Whether S. Paul himself, who often speaks of this *Simplicity*, did not understand what he meant by it ? Or, whether he acted against it, when he enjoy'd

\* See Gen. 4. and 3. 21. Psal. 20. 3. and 51. 19.

† See 2 Cor. 11. 3. 2 Cor. 1. 12. Col. 3. 22. Ephes. 6. 8.



and approv'd some Ceremonies which I before mentioned? Such Imputations would your Exposition fix upon him. But it is evident, as I said, that this *Gospel Simplicity* signifies that Purity which is opposed to Falshood, or to Deceit or Guile; but not to External Rites, so much as once in all the Gospel: Nor can it be turn'd that way but by a manifest Abuse of the Holy Scripture.

TO this you say, That if *Simple and Compound be Opposite Terms*, then is it as properly and directly opposed to *Human Rites and Ceremonies*, as it is to *Hypocrisy*. But you might as well have said, it is Opposite to *Stones and Timber*, and all compounded Things whatsoever.

YOU confess it is oppos'd to *Fleshy Wisdom*, 2 Cor. I. 12. but you allow it only to be so as it is exercised in matters of *God's Worship*, and appears in the devising and imposing of *Pompous, Mystical Rites, and Significant Ceremonies*, whereby it pretends to adorn that *Worship*. The words of the Apostle are these: *Our Rejoycing is this, the Testimony of our Conscience, that in Simplicity and Godly Sincerity, and not with Fleshy Wisdom, but by the Grace of God, we have had our Conversation in the World.* And according to your Interpretation his Meaning must be this, *It is our Comfort, that we have not Devised and Imposed Pompous and Mystical Rites, and Significant Ceremonies, &c.* A very strange Paraphrase in my Opinion. And it makes me think what

what an Extraordinary Comment you might make upon the Scripture, should you go on at this Rate. You might draw any Doctrine, and raise any Inferences from any Place whatsoever, and as well condemn our Ceremonies, out of any other Chapter or Verse in the Bible as you have done from this. These Ceremonies haunt you everywhere, and you throw any thing at them that comes to hand. They appear to you with frightful Visage, except when you meet them in the way to Preferment; and they give you great Disturbance, where no Eye can see them but your own.

\* *Ἀπλότης*

The Genuine Signification of the word which is rendred *Simplicity*, is Integrity or Sincerity. In this Sense it is used in the Greek Version of the Old Testament, and in the Writings of the New: As it is also in the Apocrypha †, and other Antient Books. And since it is thus to be understood, the Question may be, Whether the *Conformists* that live up to their Principles, or the *Dissenters* who are govern'd by yours, have the best Title to it, for the Resolution of which, the Case, as it stands between them, may thus be stated.

SUC

\* Vid. 2. Reg. 15. 18. Prov. 19. 1. 1. Par. 29. 17. answers a Word in the Hebrew, which is rendred Perfection, Integrity, Innocence, &c; and is opposed to another which signifies Craft. Vid. Kirch. Concord, Col. 2282. Vol. 2.  
† Wild, 1. 1. 1 Mac. 2. 31, 60.

SUCH Conformists, as I have mentioned, frequent our Churches, and constantly meet together, at the Set-times, to celebrate the Divine Service, according to the way of the Liturgy: And this they do out of a Sense of Religion, which renders them Uniform in their Practice, and makes their Work all of a piece. So that you may easily know what they are, and where to find them. On the other hand, your Dissenters, who joyn with them upon Occasion, do not this out of an Opinion, that the thing is in it self a Duty, but upon a *Valuable Consideration*, as it leads to *Preferment*. After this *Occasion* is over, they not only forsake the Episcopal Assemblies, but revile the Ceremonies which themselves can use without any Scruple upon *Occasion*, as *Antichristian Abominations and Defilements* of Divine Worship. They can Communicate with us at the Holy Table, and yet declare our Rites to be as *Swath in the Nails of the Almighty*.

AND now, Sir, if I may be permitted to give my Judgment in the Matter before us, I think there is on the one side nothing but *Blain-dealing*, which with me is an *Argument of Sincerity*, and to this I adhere. On the other part appears much *Craft and Shuffling*, which I cannot but abhor, as being directly contrary to the *Gospel-Simplicity*. Upon the whole, I think the *Occasional Communion* does at best need a great deal of *Charity* to free it from the Imputation of *Hypocrisy*; and that it would need a great deal

deal of Sophistry to defend it, were it capable of a Vindication.

AS for your own Plea for it, I am of Opinion, that many of your Brethren will be ashamed of it: And not at all be pleased that you should declare to the World, that they may *Occasionally* do the worst of things, things most contrary to the *Apostolick Spirit*, and such as *Paul* most abhorred. For if so, it would but give us too much reason to say of them, as the *Vox Clamantis* did, *If their Practice be not Scandalous and Offensive, and destructive to Religion and Piety, we know nothing that is so. We know nothing that will more render them in the Eyes of all, as Men of Flexible and Profligate Consciences, that can do anything: Nothing can make them seem more like to such as are justly esteemed the worst of Men.*

Pag. 53.

YOU may see how Necessary it is, to take down your Charge against the Ceremonies, unless you will expose your Friends and draw upon you their Indignation; which they may think you deserve; since you would be making Apologies for them, and yet say no more in defence of their Practice, than what may be pleaded for the worst of Crimes.

BUT after all; Were your Brethren, indeed, so eminent for what you call the *Gospel-Simplicity*, that they required nothing but what the Lord required? No such matter. The Presbyterians in Parliament requir'd, in their

the  
Sol  
by  
the

Oat  
was  
ptu  
that  
ter  
with  
whic  
Wor  
with  
to Pe  
was  
less t  
them  
Vexa  
the A

TI  
Purit  
in the  
That  
was D  
was th  
this t  
Presby

B U  
" Tha  
" Ref  
" the  
" wou

their Ordinance of Feb. 2, 1643, That the Solemn League and Covenant should be taken by the whole Congregation, Uncover'd, with their Right-hand lifted up, Bare.

THEY were not content to require an Oath in a certain Form of Words, which was so far from having any Ground in Scripture, or Support from Lawful Authority, that it was against both. But for the greater Solemnity, they would have it attended with four or five Symbolical Ceremonies, for which they had not any Command in the Word of God. They impos'd it upon All with great Rigour, and without any regard to People of Tender Consciences, except it was to insnare or ruine them. And doubtless the Imposing Spirit would have carried them much further, but that, to their great Vexation, their Measures were broken, by the *Erastians* and *Independents*.

THE *Independents* pretended to great Purity in their Worship and Discipline, and in their *Apologetical Narrative* they declar'd, That to eeke out with *Humane Prudence* what was Defective in our Light in Matters Divine, was the Fatal Error of the Reformation: And this they said not without Reflection on the *Presbyterians*.

BUT Mr. *Edwards* thereupon demands, *Edw Antap*.  
" That they would shew him, what clear P. 82, 83.

" Resolution they had from Scripture for  
" their Church-Covenant: That they  
" would give him an Apostolical Example

I

" or



“ or Rule, where ever the People alone  
 “ made Ministers: And that they would  
 “ afford him a Word either of Precept or  
 “ Example, to Authorize Lay-Elders to  
 “ examine Persons professing the Faith,  
 “ Whether they were fit for Church-Fel-  
 “ lowship, and thereupon to propound  
 “ their Names in the Congregation. In  
 “ these and other Particulars he charges  
 “ them, that they dar’d to *take* out Divine  
 “ Matters with their own Inventions: On  
 “ which he tells them, they put the Stamp  
 “ of Divine Institution, making them Es-  
 “ sential Parts of Worship.

THE Truth is, all that worship God in  
 Publick Assemblies, must use some Ceremo-  
 nies not prescrib’d in the Word of God:  
 Only they do it with this difference; some  
 think it sufficient that the External Rites  
 and Circumstances of Worship answer the  
 General Rules that are given for Decency  
 and Edification: Others pretend to have  
 particular Commands for every thing, and  
 this puts them upon wresting the Scripture  
 to serve their Occasions.

I thought it not necessary to treat parti-  
 cularly of all the Ceremonies that, in the  
 Church of *England*, are imposed both on the  
 Ministers and the People: But something I  
 said of the Sign of the Cross in *Baptism*, and  
 Kneeling at the Sacrament of the *Lord’s*-  
*Supper*, because those had been most oppos’d  
 by the Dissenters: And finding you engag’d  
 in the same Work, I gave an Account of  
 your



your Progress in it, which we are now to review.

1. THE first thing I consider'd was the Sign of the Cross; and when I had given you my Reasons for it, I reply'd to your Exceptions against it. But you tell me, That what I said on this Head, was too Frivolous to be repeated. And yet I cannot but think, that had you believ'd what you say, and thought my Reply so frivolous as you pretend, you would have repeated it for that very Reason. Instead of that, you have furnish'd me with a New Set of Objections, taken from one Mr. Polhill, which are no better than your own, and the same Answer may serve them both. And therefore I need not detain you longer on this Subject: Especially considering, that if the Signing with a Cross were an Offence, as I am well assur'd it is not, it should be imputed to the Minister, and not to the People, whose Duty and Privilege it is to demand Baptism for their Children, or for themselves, if they wanted it before, and are qualified for it.

P. 149.

AND as Mr. Baxter has determin'd in this Case, Another Man's Sinful Mode will not justify the Neglect of their Duty: Else we must joyn in any Prayer or Sacrament in which the Minister Modally sinneth, that is with me.

Chr. Direct.  
P. 826.

1 2

2. KNEEL-

2. KNEELING at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper you oppos'd, 1<sup>st</sup>, As not Agreeable to the Gesture of Christ and his Disciples in the first Institution of it. 2<sup>dly</sup>, As a Scandalous Gesture symbolizing with the Idolatry of the Church of Rome.

First, YOU oppos'd Kneeling at the Sacrament, as not Agreeable to the Gesture of Christ and his Disciples in the first Institution of it. *He that Instituted it, you said, did best understand the Nature and Ends of it, and what Gesture and Circumstance would best become the Celebration of it.* ----- And when we look back, we find that Christ sate down with the Twelve to eat the Passover with them, *Matt. 26. 20.* And for Sitting, you also produce *Mark 14. 18. Luke 22. 14.* You also pretended, That in the same Posture our Saviour Administred his Last Supper to his Disciples: For which you cited *Luke 22. 17. 18, 19.* And all the Evangelists, you said, that particularly mention the manner of his administering this Ordinance, speak expressly of his Sitting, but of his Kneeling not a word. And this I confess'd, might seem Plausible to the meer English Reader, that never made any great Enquiry into the matter: Yet is it nothing but a heap of Errors, consisting of False Interpretations of Scripture, and False Inferences from them. For upon a due Research we shall find,

1. THAT

1. THAT it doth not appear, that our Lord used the same Gesture at the Passover, and at the Institution of the Sacrament of his Body and Blood.

2. IF he had, that Gesture was not Sitting.

3. IF it had been Sitting, he design'd it not as a Law or Pattern to all Succeeding Times.

First, IT doth not appear that our Lord used the same Gesture at the Passover, and at the Institution of the Sacrament of his Body and Blood. Nor does St. Luke say a word of it, nor any thing tending that way in the places to which you have refer'd me. But you tell me, That I confess, that both *P. 152.* Matthew and Mark express it so, as that *both Ordinances, the Passover and the Lord's Supper, made up but One Action.* So that had St. Luke express'd it according to my Imagination, yet have you Two Witnesses to me against me. A very Notable Supposition, that the Evangelists should be Witnesses against one another!

BUT there is another Thing for which I must here call you to an Account, and this is a most Disingenuous Falsification of my words; For I said not, as you have reported, that these Ordinances made up but One Action, but that they might seem to make but One Continued Action. So that you have

Ἐδιδόντων  
αὐτοῖς.

have set down that as my Assertion, which was only an Objection, to which I presently return'd this Answer, *Their seeming to make of but One Continued Action, is owing to our Translation, for the Greek may be rendered thus, When they had eaten, &c.*

BUT say you, What Pity was it you had not been one of the Translators of the Bible, or a Supervisor of that Work! Pray Sir, be not offended, if I ask you, by what Rule of Grammar or Authority, you will thus turn the Present into a Prater Tense. As if an Enallage of Tenses were not very common in the Holy Scripture! But Scaliger \* thought, that the word here used is the Second Aorist: And Beza † was inclin'd the same way. And I think it will be allow'd, that these are Persons, who had a competent Understanding of the Greek Tongue. Be it as it will: It is very certain, that what St. Matthew and St. Mark say of the Disciples eating, must be understood of the time past: Because, as I have prov'd from Luk. 22. 20. and from 1 Cor. 11. 25. it was after the Paschal Supper that he Instituted his own. But before the latter, he gave Thanks, as I observed from 1 Cor. 11. 24. And doubtless he did this in some Posture of Reverence, from which we do not find that he varied in all the Solemnity.

\* Vid. Synops. Crit. in Matt. 26. 26.

† --- Nisi malimus Aoristi Secundi significatione interpretari, cum autem Cibum sumissent. Bez. in loc. Alii Spongia. Dopo ch' ebber mangiato: c. l' Agnello, Diodat.

AY, doubtless, say you, he did it Reverent- P. 152.  
ly: But who ever told you, that he did it *Kneeling*? — I fancy that your Endeavour to Criticize hath disorder'd your Intellect, and left you in a Cloud. No, Sir; but I see very clearly, that you are attempting, by the help of this Scurrility, to make your Escape from the Question; which is not, Whether our Saviour *Kneel'd*? But whether he *Sate* at the time of his Thanksgiving? Not whether *Kneeling* be the only Posture of Reverence, which no Body will assert or grant; but whether *Sitting* be such a Posture, which I suppose you will hardly affirm.

Secondly, IF our Saviour Christ and his Apostles did use the same Gesture at the Passover and at the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, it was not *Sitting*. Nor do the Places which you have cited from the Evangelists affirm it was. Indeed, as their words are translated in our English Bibles, they make much for your purpose: But they have a very different Signification in the Original, and intimate to us, that Christ and his Disciples lay on Beds, after the manner of the Greeks and Romans.

THIS I prov'd by several Instances, and I take it to be an Observation of great use for the Illustration of several Passages of the Holy Scripture.

YOU reply to it in these words: *Here again you shew your Dislike of the Translation; and how much you will please to allow us, as the true Translation of our Bibles, I cannot tell; but wish you would once bless the Church with your more Accurate Edition, that we may know what to believe in them.* As if the People could not tell what to believe, but must turn Scepticks in Religion, if there be any Defects in our Translation of the Bible! There is no Body doubts but our Translation, Excellent as it is, may be advanced to greater Perfection. Nor doth any Learned Man, that I know, now deny, that the Criticism concerning the Discumbing Posture (which I have not assum'd to my self, but only recited from others) is just and well-grounded. And this is the thing that gave you Disturbance; you had nothing that is Serious or of Moment to reply to it, and it put you upon the Pin of Scoffing.

BUT you are not to escape thus: For the Case being as I have represented it, I must again demand of you, Why you have forsaken the Example of Christ, to follow the Invention of Men? Or, to speak in your way, *Hath he told you again and again, that he and his Disciples did eat in a Discumbing Posture, and must you prefer Sitting before it? Will you tell him, that you have discovered a better way than he hath taught and practised? And dare you thus Blaspheme his Wisdom? May he not demand of you, who made you his Counsellours, or his Correctors?* Or

Let. i. P. 89.



who hath required this Sitting from you? You see how your own Expostulations recoil upon you, and fly very sorely in your Face. It is to you that I was indebted for these Expressions, and a great deal more of the sort.

BUT say you, *What tho' the Sitting down at Meat, was not in those Times and Countries, exactly the same Gesture in Figure of Body, with that which is the Fashion of our own Country in Sitting at Table, doth that alter the Nature, or End of the thing? And why then should it alter the Name of it? The Greeks and Romans of Old, and many other Countries at this Day, have a different Way and Mode of Sitting to eat at their Tables, must it not therefore be called Sitting? Yes, doubtless: For, as you well observe, Sitting is Sitting in all Places; but, I think, laying down is another thing.*

IT is to no purpose then that you say, *Let every Country sit after its own Fashion: for this signifies nothing, but that to save your self, you are forced to give a New Name to the Posture in which the Passover was eaten, that you may make it Conformable to your Table Gestures. But if your Brethren would be just to their Principles, they must tell you that you have violated the Institution of Christ, and that you have taken down the Pattern in the Mount, that you may give it a New Shape, according to the Fashion of the Country.*

YOU

YOU now say, You do not think, that by the Example of our Saviour, we are strictly obliged to the same Gesture in the Sacrament, but that it may be done as acceptably, and to a good Effect, either Sitting, Recumbent or Kneeling. — Yes a Liberty being granted, you cannot without Superstition be bound to This or That. Cannot you indeed? Why then did your Directory require sitting at the Lord's Supper? Or how can it be your Bounden Duty to Kneel at this Ordinance upon Occasion; when it is enjoyn'd by the same Authority as at other times? What is that makes the same thing an Act of Piety, when it may be for your Profit, and Superstition, when it is not?

IT being well known, that many of the Dissenters have contended, That the Gesture of Christ and his Disciples was designed to be a Rule to all future Ages: I therefore demanded, How they dur'd to warp it to their own Custom at the Table? And why they did not as well exchange the Sacramental Wine for Ordinary Table Drink? But This, you say, is an Idle Question, but your Answer to it is, that Wine is the Instituted Matter and Element of the Sacrament. But the Gesture is only a Variable Circumstance. And this is very true. But neither is it what the Persons will say against whom I argue, nor so fit to come from you, who had declared that to prefer another Gesture at the Lord's Supper before that which was used at the Passover, was to Blaspheme the Wisdom of Je-

*in Christ.* Which I hope you do not take to be a thing Indifferent.

ANOTHER thing, about which I made Enquiry, was, The Reason why the Dissenters do not partake of the Sacrament with their Hats on, if that be their Way of Eating at their Tables? And this with you is another *Idle Question*. But I was willing to propose it, because the *Brownists*, in pursuance of the Doctrine which they had been taught by the *Presbyterians*, affirm'd that Uncovering the Head at the Lord's Supper is a *Corrupt Sign*, or an *Idolatrous Ceremony*. It is one of the things, they said, which the Scripture prescribes not, but Men have taken it up of themselves, when breaking the second Commandment, and joining their Hats and Thimbles with the Lord's. Men are thus drawn away from the simplicity of the Practice used by Christ and his Apostles, who sate when they ate and drank, and no more uncover then, than they did before. And this, Sir, is so like your Reasoning, that I was desirous to have some Satisfaction from you in the Matter.

YOU are now content to give me the best you can, and tell me, That we do not partake of this Ordinance with our Hats on, because we find that this is an Irreverence expressly condemn'd by the Apostle in Acts of solemn Worship. Very well! Then the partaking of this Sacrament is an Act of solemn Worship, from which Irreverent Gestures are to be excluded. And whether, on this Account, sitting or kneeling are fittest to be laid aside, or whe-

whether of these Ceremonies are best suited to Acts of Adoration, I dare leave you to judge: But it must be when you are recover'd out of your *Raving Delirium*, and your Thoughts are most Sedate.

Thirdly, IF the Gesture of Christ at the Institution of the Sacrament had been Sitting, he design'd it not as a Law or Pattern to all succeeding Times.

MY Reason is, because he hath not revealed it to us: None of the Evangelists, whom you cite so very confidently for it, have said a word of it. Nor hath St. Paul, who hath so fully declared what he receiv'd of the Lord concerning the Eucharist, left us any Instructions about it. It is certain, that we can find no Ground for it in Scripture; and therefore it is to us, as if it had never been, and the Imposing of it as a Necessary Duty, is adding to the Word of God, and a *Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*.

YOU now grant, it is but a *variable Circumstance*. And then, if it was once in use, there might be a Reason for the Alteration of it. And it is to be consider'd, as I told you in my Vindication, that our Blessed Lord being come, *not to be ministred unto, but to minister, treated his Disciples with great Familiarity*: And that Way of Address and Deportment towards him might be proper for them in the Days of his Flesh, which is not so for us, now that he is exalted

ted to Glory. He is now the known Object of our Adoration, and surely then it may be fit to worship him upon our Knees, when he comes to seal our Pardon, and to consign over to us the Inestimable Benefits of his Cross and Passion.

But say you P. 156. *What is that Way of Address which he now expects? And how came you to know so much of his Mind, above all other Men? Or when did he discover this to you?* We expect to be satisfied of the Truth of this Enthusiasm, before we can give you the Credit or Obedience which you demand of us. Sir, had these words dropt from the Pen of a profess'd Papist, I should not have wondered at all at the design of them. Nor indeed do I at all wonder at your design to enlarge the Borders of Popery. But what is here, with you, Popery and Enthusiasm, is most certainly grounded on the Holy Scripture, which does assure us, That after our Lord had been found in the fashion of a Man, and humbled himself, and became Obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross, God hath highly Exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name: That at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of Things in Heaven, and Things in Earth, and Things under the Earth: And that every Tongue should confess, That Jesus Christ is the Lord, to the Glory of God the Father, Philip. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11.

Secondly,



Secondly, YOU pleaded that Kneeling to the Sacrament is now become scandalous, because it symbolizes with the Idolatry of the Church of Rome in Worshipping the Host. And you now say, That the Relation it hath to Idolatry is enough to make it an Abomination to us, who are Protestants: And that since it hath been Idolatrously abused, it is something worse than bare Superstition. A heavy Charge: But you have no better Argument to support it than that which the Brownists made use of for the Destruction of Churches: Which was, because they had been built for the Breaden Gods, and other Idols; and had been made Synagogues of Satan.

YOUR Reasoning against the Sign of the Cross at Baptism, and Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, exactly agrees with that of the Brownists: For you have both grounded it upon some Mosaiical Precepts, and some Examples in the Old Testament, that are Conformable to them, and both alike misapplied. The Way you were in would have led you farther, as it did some in the last Age, who had a Design, if we may believe Cromwel †, to destroy all other Administrations; and to set up the Judicial Law of Moses, to be administred according to the Wisdoms of any Man, that would have Interpreted

\* See Pager's Arrow. Ch. 7.

† See his Speech to those who desired him to accept of the Crown. Printed A. D. 1679.



the Text, *this way or that.* A Project that would have made strange Work had it come to effect: And it may serve to shew, how Error thrives in its Progress, and how Seducers grow worse and worse; deceiving others, and being themselves deceived.

BUT to the Brownists and your self I answer, That God did indeed command his People to pluck down, and utterly demolish all the High Places; all the Places where the Nations served their Gods; and to destroy all Monuments of Idolatry. But these Laws were given only to Israel, and are not Obligatory to us that are under the Gospel. The Wisest Part of Christians have long since determin'd, that Houses which had been Dedicated to False Deities, may be employ'd for the Worship of the True God: And of Ceremonies that had been abused, they have had the same Opinion, and not without Reason. For St. Paul tells us, *That is the Part all things are pure,* Tit. 1. 15. And therefore the same things are not made Pollutions to them by the Defilements of other Men. Otherwise, it would be in the Power of any wicked and profane Wretches to make all External Rites Sinful to us, and consequently render the Publick Worship of God Impracticable. They might make Sitting an Abomination as well as Kneeling, and they might do the same with any other Gesture. But we are not to submit to such an Intolerable Yoke of Bondage, nor may we think that Idolaters, and other Criminals, can, by their own Practices, make as many

Num. 33 32.

Deut. 12. 2.

many Sins for us as they think fit. We are to stand fast in the Liberty with which Christ has made us free : Yet must we exercise this Liberty in such a manner, as is consistent with the Charity which we owe to others, and may be for the *Edifying of the Church in Love* : In such a way as may not hinder us from Obeying those that are over us in the Lord ; or from maintaining the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.

BUT these are things which you seem very little to regard, and yet you can bring your Friends upon their Knees upon other Inducements ; and whilst you censure us as guilty of something worse than *Superstition*, on the account of a Ceremony, you allow them to use the same, and absolve them as Innocent. According to your Scheme, we that joyn in the Publick Worship according to the Liturgy, and thereby preserve the Unity of the Church, are condemn'd ; and they that do the very same thing, to preserve or advance their Estates in the World, are justified. We that do it to save our Souls, act against the Gospel-Simplicity ; and they that do it to save their Money, act according to the Gospel-Wisdom. We partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that we may secure a Title to Heaven, and our doing this is a *Scandalous Symbolizing with the Church of Rome*, and an *Abomination* ; they do the same thing, and in the same manner, to gain Preferment on Earth, and with them it is a Prudential Way of providing for themselves and Families.

milies. Happy Men! who have got such an Advocate, as can make that commendable in them, which with us admits of no Apology. Certainly you have furnish'd them with Large and Unaccountable Priviledges, which are not to be parallel'd in any History.

I need say no more in Vindication of our Ceremonies, or to free them from your Aspersions: But meeting with your *Occasional Communicants* at every turn, I shall now more fully and distinctly consider your Plea for their Double Dealing: And finding that you argue for it, from *Necessity*, from the Example of *S. Paul*, and from the Nature of *Things Indifferent*, I shall examine what you have said under these Three Heads, in the Method that I have propos'd them.

i. Y O U argue, That the Dissenters were under such a Necessity of Compliance with us, as made that Lawful which otherwise would have been Sinful, and became so, when that Necessity was remov'd. For, p. 42. say you, *the Shew-bread under the Law, was in it self a thing Indifferent; but by the Ordinance of God about it was sacred, and not Lawful to be eaten, but by the Priests only. Yet David and his Men, when they were hungry, and had no other Bread ready, did eat it, and not sin in so doing: Which had they done at another time, and under other Circumstances, they had been guilty.* And from hence you would infer, that your Brethren may *Occasionally* joyn in our Communion, when they

Mat. 12. 3,

K can

can have no other ; and yet to do it constantly would be an Offence : This I take to be your Meaning. But neither is the Consequence good that you would draw from this Example of *David*, nor is your Practice at all parallel to his. For

1<sup>st</sup>. WHAT *David* did was not against the Intent of the Law, but only against the Letter of it. He had the Equity, by which it was to be interpreted; on his side : and might conclude, that it was not Obligatory, in the Extremity to which he was reduced. This is what God himself hath declared, where he says, *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice.* But he has no where told you, nor given you any Intimation, that you may serve him in the use of such Ceremonies as he himself hath condemn'd, and which are something worse than *Superstition*.

*Hosea 6. 6.*

*Matth. 12.*

2<sup>dly</sup>. WHAT *David* did was to satisfy his Hunger, and not to perform an Act of Worship : and so it differs in the whole kind from our Sacramental Communion. Your Argument therefore from the one to the other is of no force. But to make this more evident, it may be consider'd, that God was highly offended with those, who in a Religious Matter, would break one of his Positive Institutions for the sake of another ; notwithstanding they had for it an Appearance of Necessity. *Uzza* had so, when he put his hand to the Ark ; and his Endeavour to support it, when it was sta-

ken

ken by the *stumbling of the Oxen*, seem'd to argue a Zeal for the *Mosaick Rites*. But what he did being against the *Mosaick Law*, it kindled the Anger of God, who smote him for it, and he died. When *Saul* offer'd the *Burnt Offering*, there seem'd to be a Necessity for it, and it was the thing he pleaded in his own defence. He had *carried*, he said, *seven Days* for *Samuel*, and the People were scattered from him; so that he was afraid, the *Philistines* would come upon him before he had made Supplication to the Lord. But because he had not longer expected *Samuel*, to offer the Sacrifice, according to the Divine Appointment, God was offended with him, and put a Period to his Kingdom. From what has been said it is clear, that we may not conclude, from the Gracious Allowance, that God was pleased to make to supply the Wants of Nature, that he would grant the like Indulgence on the Account of his Ordinances. We have seen that he made a difference between them: And one Reason of this may be, that the Necessities of Nature are Real, but such as were pleaded for some Religious Observances against the Letter of the Law, were only Feigned and Imaginary. *David* had a Real Need of Bread, and we have a Real Need of Mercy, but the Almighty had never any Need of Sacrifice. Nor did he ever make it Absolutely Necessary; or exact it from his People, except when they were able to offer it up in such ways as were consistent with his Statutes, or Declared Will. He hath no need of our Publick Assemblies, nor has he



made it Necessary for us to meet together, and joya with others in the Solemnities of Worship, except when we can do it in such a manner as he hath not forbidden. He had rather that we should not tread his Courts, than we should pollute them with Idolatry and Superstition: And rather have no Services from us, than such as are a *Stink* in his Nose, and an Abomination to him.

Pag. 44

IT follows, that if our Ceremonies were such as you have represented them, there is nothing in the Example of *David*: Nor is there any thing in all the Scripture, that can justify your Occasional Communion. It is in vain then, that you tell me, that having been under a Necessity of Worshipping God with us, or not at all, you judged our Ceremonious Worship more Eligible than an Utter Deprivation. For you neither were, nor could be, under a Necessity of not Worshipping God at all, nor were you capable of Utter Deprivation without your own Consent. But if you mean this of the Publick Worship, and if that in our Churches answer your Description of it, it was far less Eligible than Death it self; and you had far better have let it alone, than to have defil'd your selves with it.

I must not here omit what you say, That if in the Famine of Samaria, the People might eat of an Asses Head and Doves Dung; and nothing was so Ceremonially or Naturally Unclean, but they might feed upon it: But afterwards they might not be limited to the same Diet; you might,



might, in like manner, joyn in our Communion, when you could have no better, and abandon it afterwards when your Steps were enlarged: Especially considering, that your Souls are more precious than your Bodies. How weak this Reasoning is, if one may call it by that name, appears from what has been said, and from your own Confession, That the Act of Indulgence has not alter'd the Case, as to the Nature of the thing, that is in Debate between us. But my Exception against your was, That you should distinguish in such a manner, that your way of Worship must resemble a Feast, and ours be like the eating of an *Asses Head* and *Pidgeons Dung* in the time of Famine: And that you were not ashamed to compare the Divine Service, according to the Liturgy, to things so vile. You call'd it a *Familiar Similitude*: and I confess'd that it is *Familiar* enough, but withal it is so Impudent and Profane, that I could not reflect on it without a just Indignation. And I doubted not but many of your Brethren would be much disgusted at it, and not be willing to have it thought, that they came with us to the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, as they would to the Eating of *Dung*, or that they were of so Abject a Temper, that for avoiding the Penalty of the Law, they would joyn with us in a way of Worship, which they had in the utmost Detestation.

AT this you are very Angry, and tell me, that I should have put a little Distinction between a *Comparison* and a *Similitude*; and

Page 30.

that Similitudes have not four Feet. And say you, Sure a very small Tannillum of your Spirit of Charity, if rightly drawn and applied, might have a little sweetned the Matter, and perswaded you to believe, I could not be so Profane as to compare your Divine Services, to such things as they are Divine Services, but only as far as they were of Human Invention, and Defilements of Divine Worship: As they are Dead Carcasses, fitter for the Grave than the Altar; and as they are Blended with Offensive Ceremonies, and are Abominations. And now you have much mended the matter, by distinguishing our Ordinances from Dung, when at the same time you have Blended them both together, and not content to serve us again with the same Dish, you have added dead Carcasses to the Asses Head, for our Religious Entertainment. But to the Hungry Soul, you say, every bitter thing is sweet. And much good may it do those hungry souls, who to save a little Money, or to gain more, can feed on an Asses Head, or a dead Carcase; on Garbage, or filthy Excrements.

2. FOR your Compliance with us at one time, and not at another, you produce the Example of S. Paul. We have, say you, the Example of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, to warrant our Practice. You may see what his Opinion was of the Jewish Rites and Ceremonies, and how he had in several of his Epistles declared against them, as Beggarly Elements, Gal. 4. 9. Antichristian, Chap. 5. 2. Inconsistent with the Liberty of the Gospel, V. 1. Another Gospel than that which he had preached to them.

Chap.

Chap. 1. V. 6, 7, 8. And pronounces Anathema on them that troubled them with it, V. 9. And yet for all this, the Wise and Holy Paul, to avoid the Offending his Weak Brethren, would not scruple for once to Circumcise Timothy, Acts 16. 3. At another time to shave his Head, and observe the Jewish Rites of a Religious Vow, Acts 18. 18. And at another, to save himself from the Rage of a Company of Bigots at Jerusalem, he appeared as a Nazarite, with all the Formalities the Law required in that Case, Ch. 21. 24. This he could do Occasionally, according to the Liberty he had in Christ, which he was careful to preserve; and not to be brought under the Power of these things, which is contrary to the Nature and Free State of the Gospel. And having this Apostolical Precedent, our Consciences are Free in this matter.

AND yet I cannot but doubt, that the same Consciences that are sometimes too stiff, are Occasionally a little too Flexible. So yours seems to be here: For with its Connivance or Approbation, you have made a False Representation of the *Mosaick Ceremonies*, and wrongfully applied the Practice of the Apostle to the Service of your Interest.

First, YOU have made a False Representation of the *Mosaick Ceremonies*: For they had nothing in them of the Evil which you have imputed to them. 'Tis true, St. Paul calls them, *Weak and Beggary Elements*: Weak, because they had no Virtue in them

K 4

to

See Heb. 9. 9. to sanctify those that used them. The Legal Sacrifices could not make the Comers unto them Perfect. They were *Beggarly* or

Πτωχὰ 501- Poor, as the word may be rendred, compared with the Riches of the Gospel. They were *Elements*, or the Beginnings of Greater and more Excellent Matters, as Letters are the Rudiments of Speech. They were a Shadow of good things to come, and of less value than the things themselves. But this does not ascribe any Evil to them, much less does it prove, as you pretend, That he said worse things of them, than the Nonconformists have done against the Church of England.

Heb. 10. 1.

HE no where declares, as you affirm, that the *Mosaick Ceremonies* were *Antichristian*. He says indeed to the *Galatians*, If ye be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing, Chap. 5. V. 2. But this is only to be understood of those that held Circumcision to be Necessary, and were intangled again in the Yoke of Bondage, V. 1. For otherwise the Apostle himself, when he Circumcised *Timothy*, had put him out of a Capacity of Salvation.

HE did not say, as you pretend, that the Ceremonies were Inconsistent with the Liberty of the Gospel, or that they were another Gospel; nor doth he pronounce an *Anathema* against all that used them. For so, when he shaved his Head, and observed the Jewish Rites of a Religious Vow; and when he appear'd as a *Nazarite*, with all the Formalities which the Law required in that Case, he acted

acted against his own Principle, and brought himself under a very Dreadful Curse.

EVERY good Christian must abhor such a Reflection on him, and consequently must detest your Interpretation of his Words. But, as far as I can perceive, you would have him do any thing *to which he had the greatest Aversion*; any thing whatsoever for a Good End. But you should have remembered, that they were Blasphemers who reported, that the Apostles said, *Let us do Evil that Good may come*. And you should also have considered what St. Paul says of them, *That their Damnation is just*, Rom. 3. 8.

Page 139.

IT is evident then, that what St. Paul declared, concerning the *Mosaick Ceremonies*, in the Places which you have cited from him, is not so to be understood, as if he condemn'd the things themselves: For however they were before but as a Rough Alphabet, by which God instructed his People in their Infancy; however, they had never any Power to produce Spiritual Effects, and had now lost their Figurative or sacramental Use; yet as the Apostle demonstrated by his own Practice, they were not Sinful. What he opposed then was the Doctrine of those, who held the *Mosaick Rites* to be Necessary, and would have brought the Gentile Converts under the *Yoke of Bondage*. And he had great Reason to be offended with them; for they obstinately rejected the Priviledges which Christ had purchased for them, and would not endure



endure that others should accept of them. They acted by such Principles as are Inconsistent with Justification by Faith, and are destructive of the Covenant of Grace. But nothing of this kind can be charged upon the Conformists, whose Opinion about Ceremonies is as contrary to that of the *Judaizers*, as Light is to Darkness.

Secondly, THERE is nothing in the Practice of *St. Paul*, that can be a Plea for your *Occasional Communion* with us, and *Strained Separation* from us. I granted, that his Example does justify your late Conformity before the Indulgence; and my reason was, That if the Apostle was so yielding to the *Judaizers*, who had no Authority to command him, and that in the things against which, as they were urged, he had very strong Objections; you have far more reason to comply with your Superiors in things that are not liable to such Exceptions. But what is there in all his Proceedings, that may be a Ground of your Desertion of us? If he sometimes laid aside the Mosaical Rites, which were urged by some as Necessary to Salvation, and thereby made another Gospel; must you reject our Ecclesiastical Rites, which are in themselves Indifferent, and by the Imposers are declar'd to be so? If, as he saw Occasion, he used not the Jewish Ceremonies, some of which were appointed to be Types of the Coming of Christ, and which, according to his own Determination, were to be Abrogated, must you oppose the Ceremonies, which are



them prescribed for no such End, and for the dissuading of which no Revelation can be produced? If he would not be brought under the Power of the things to which he was no way obliged; must you cast off the Power of Men, who are over you in the Lord? If he exercised his Liberty, sometimes in using, and sometimes in abstaining from, the same things, when he was limited to neither by any Law; must you break the Laws, which require nothing of you that is Sinful? If he acted so variously, that he might work up a Jews and Gentiles, and gather them into One Body, and confirm their Union in it; must you tear the Body in pieces, or weaken it by Divisions? These Quæres I proposed to you in my Vindication; but you thought fit to pass by them in Silence; and yet insist upon the same Argument that was the occasion of them, with as much assurance as if nothing had been said against

3. YOU argue for your Occasional Communion with us, and Stated Separation from us, from the Nature of Indifferent Things, which, you say, is such, that they stand equally determinable to Lawful or Unlawful: so that the least supervening Circumstance of a Necessary Good, or a Good necessarily depending on it, makes them to be no more Indifferent, but Good and Necessary. And on the contrary, the least Kind or Degree of Evil, makes them to be Evil. And therefore in determining the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of things Indifferent, we must justly and faithfully examine, What that Good and

## Of the Separation of the Dissenters

and Evil is, that necessarily depends on them, and that will be the Consequents of them. Hence it is, that the Rites and Ceremonies now in Controversy, being in themselves things Indifferent, tho' in some respects Evil in their use; yet so far as they are over-ballanced by a Preponderating Good, to which under present Circumstances they necessarily conduce, they are Lawfully submitted to; but further than that Necessary Good End is attainable by them, they are justly rejected as Evil. That is, if we may judge of this by the rest of your Apology, when our Ceremonies turn to Account, or may be for the Advantage of your selves and Families, there is a Preponderating Good that inclines you to them, and Overballances all the Ill things you have said of them; but when that is wanting, they relapse into Abominations. When you have no Turn to serve by them, they are against the Invincible Sentiments of Conscience; but when they would lead you to a Post of Honour, your Objections against them are answered on a sudden, your Scruples presently vanish, and your Conscience is as Free to use them, as if they were grounded on the Express Command of Heaven. Now this, Sir, is what seems to us a Perfect Juggle, and is commonly esteemed no better than a Mortgaging Conscience for Preferment.

I shew'd before, that if your Representation of our Ceremonies be Just, they are not to be reckon'd amongst things Indifferent, but must be always Sinful. However, I agree with you in General, that things which

which are indeed Indifferent, may, by a Supervening Circumstance of a Necessary Good, become Good and Necessary. But thus the use of our Ceremonies becomes a Duty, not directly, or in it self, but by consequence: and that more especially for these two Reasons: The one is, because it is enjoyned by our Governours: The other, because it is a Means of continuing us in the Unity of the Church.

1. THE Use of the Ceremonies is become a Duty to us, because it is enjoyn'd by our Governours: For to their Determination we ought to submit in such Matters, if in any thing at all. There was Antiently a Dispute amongst Philosophers, whether any Obedience was due to a Father: and some, to exercise their Wit, thus argu'd against it; "If that be Evil, which a Father Commands, it ought not to be done: If it be Good and Just, it ought to be done, tho' he had said nothing about it: so his Command is no more than an Empty and Insignificant Sound, and no Obedience is due to him at all. But *Aulus Gellius*, who Noct. Ar. Lib. 2. C. 7. relates this, refutes it as a Frivolous way of Reasoning, and observes, that there are other things, which in their Nature are neither Good nor Evil, but of a Middle Kind: and these, he says, are under the Power of a Parent, and he ought to be Obey'd in them. And certainly if our Rulers have Authority in things Indifferent, they have it in none; And if we are not to be

concluded by their Decisions in such Mat-  
ters, we need not observe them in Any.

2. THE use of our Ceremonies is not  
a Duty, because, in the present State of  
things, it is a Means of continuing in the  
Unity of the Church. This is a *Preponderat-  
ing Circumstance* that *Overballants* all your  
Objections against it. For we are required  
Rom. 12. 18. as far as it is Possible, and as far as lyeth  
in us, to live peaceable with all Men. And now  
especially ought we to do it, with those  
who are Members of Christ, and for whom  
he Pray'd, that they may be One, as he and  
the Father are One, John 17. 21. *quo ew*

WHAT I have said may give some  
Light to several Cases concerning things in-  
different: and may shew, with what Limi-  
tations we are to understand the following  
Rules, which have often been produced by  
the Dissenters, against Conformity.

1st, ONE Rule is, that in Matters Indi-  
fferent we ought not to act with a *Double  
Conscience*: for which this Reason is given,  
that *Whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin*, Rom.  
14. 23. And I acknowledge, that when  
a Person is under apprehensions, that the eat-  
ing some kind of Meat, which is the Thing  
the Apostle speaks of, is a Sin; but is Con-  
tinue that it is no Sin, not to Eat it, tho'  
to Eat it is Culpable, and Forbearance is  
Duty. but the Case is much alter'd, when  
a thing, in it self lawful, is commanded by  
Authority, and an Observance of it is  
Mean

Means of preserving us in the Unity of the Church; for then our Compliance is a Duty; and what is so, cannot be Cancell'd by our Doubts and Scruples. Otherwise the more of these a Person entertains, the less Regard need he pay to the Laws of God or Man: and he that can be a *Pyrrhonian*, may be freed from all Obligations to Virtue and Obedience.

Mr. Baxter says very well, " That if we Disput. of Ch. through Weakness or Perverseness take Government. Lawful things to be Unlawful, That will not excuse us in our Disobedience. Our Error is our Sin, and one Sin will not excuse another. --- And the Duty of Obeying those that Rule over us being Certain, and the Sinfulness of the things Commanded being Uncertain and Unknown, and only Suspected, we must go on the *Surer Side*. Pag. 484

21v, ANOTHER Rule is, that since all things that are Lawful are not alike worthy of our Choice, we ought to prefer before the rest such as are most *Expedient*. But when it is to be consider'd, that some things may be Simply and in themselves most *Expedient*; they may appear so to us; or be so in reality, were we left to the full exercise of our Liberty; which would not be so much as Lawful for us; as we are under Government and Members of a Community. For Example, If it were left to us to appoint days of Publick Fasting or Thanksgiving, upon proper Occasions, we ought to make



make choice of such as we thought the fittest for those Purposes: But being under Authority, we ought to acquiesce in the Determinations of it; and rather, in compliance with it, use such times as we judge less *Expedient*, than to make Disturbances about them. If it were left to us, we should make choice of the Best Translation of the Bible, and which according to the best Judgment we could frame of the Matter, we thought most *Expedient*, to be read in our Churches; as also of such a Version of the Psalms, as we thought fittest to be sung in our Assemblies; And yet in Obedience to our Superiours; we ought to be Content with such Translations or Versions as we esteem less Perfect, rather than make Divisions about them. Many other Instances which I have given, are easily Applicable to this Case: and I shall add no more but what has been said by a Pious and Learned Prelate, "That to allow Men, under Pretence of *Inexpediency*, to disobey Laws and Constitutions made by those that are in Authority; were the next way to cut the Sinews of all Authority, and to bring Magistrates and Laws into Contempt. For what Law ever was made, or can be made, so just and Reasonable, but some Man, or other either did, or might take Offence at it. And what Man that is dispos'd to Disobey, but may pretend some *Expediency* or other, to Countenance his Disobedience?"

Bp. Sanders  
Serm. on  
1 Cor. 10. 23.



3. A Third Rule is, that in the use of things Indifferent, we ought to be careful not to give *Offence*. But then I must add, that the meaning of this cannot be, that we must never, in such things, displease our Weak Brethren.

" Abundance have thought, says Mr. Baxter \*, that they may not use any Form, or Words, or Order, or Action, especially if it be indifferent in itself, at which others are grieved: because they think That is a *Scandal*. Indeed, there is a grieving others, which is *Scandal*; that is, when by grieving them we occasion them to Sin. But consider, I beseech you, these Two things.

" 1st. WHAT a wretched Person that is, who will sin against God, every time that his Brother doth not humour him. Dare you say, *Do not use such a Form of Prayer, or such a Ceremony, for if you do, I will sin against God?* This is an Answer doubtless that none would have the Confidence to give, and therefore it must be rejected as useless, and of no Moment.

L

" 2ly

---

\* Cure of Church Divisions, pag. 133.

“ 2ly. IF bare Displeasing had been  
 “ *Scandal*, then Peevishness and Ignorance  
 “ would have advanced all that had them  
 “ to be Governours of the World. For  
 “ what is it to Govern, but to have all o-  
 “ thers obliged to fulfil your Wills! And  
 “ if no Man must displease you, then all  
 “ must fulfil your Wills: And he is *Scan-*  
 “ *dalous* that is not Rul’d by you. And if  
 “ this were so, the most Childish and Wo-  
 “ manish sort of Christians, who have the  
 “ Weakest Judgments and the Strongest  
 “ Wills and Passions, must Rule all the  
 “ World: For these are the hardest  
 “ pleased, and no Man must displease  
 “ them.

BUT continues he, “ I beseech you re-  
 “ member, That *Scandal* lieth in pleasing  
 “ Men, as well as displeasing them, when  
 “ it may harden them in an Error, or  
 “ tempt them to any Sin: I will instance  
 “ to you in two *Scandalous* Acts of Peter  
 “ himself:

“ THE first was to *Christ*: Matt. 16.  
 “ 22, 23. Where he thought to please  
 “ him, and save him from Suffering, and  
 “ would have had him to spare, or favour  
 “ himself; And Christ saith, *Get thee be-*  
 “ *hind me Satan, thou art an Offence unto me.*  
 “ The Greek Word is, a *Scandal*: That is,  
 “ thou wouldest do as Satan did, even  
 “ tempt me to Sin, and neglect the  
 “ Work,

" Work, about which I came into the  
" World.

" THE other was in *Galat. 2. 12. 13.*  
" where *Peter* did *Scandalize* the *Jews* by  
" pleasing them. For fear of *Offending* the  
" Weak *Judaizing* Christians, he Separat-  
" ed from Familiar Communion with the  
" Gentiles. By which he laid a Stumbling  
" Block or Temptation before them, to  
" harden them in the Sinful Opinion of Se-  
" paration. If it had been done in our  
" Days, many would have been drawn a-  
" way with *Barnabas*, and thought that  
" *Peter* had not given *Scandal* to the Jewish  
" Christians, but only Separated for fear of  
" *Scandalizing* them. And many a time, I  
" have rather gone to the Common-Prayers  
" of the Publick Assemblies, for fear of be-  
" ing a *Scandal* to those same Men who  
" call'd them a *Scandal*: That is, for fear  
" of hardening them in a Sinful Separation  
" and Error; because I knew that  
" That was not *Scandal* which they cal-  
" led *Scandal*; that is, Displeasing them  
" and Crossing their Opinions: But hard-  
" ning them in an Error, or other Sin,  
" is true *Scandalizing*.

" UNDERSTAND this, or you will  
" displease God, under the Pretence of  
" avoiding *Scandal*.

Mr. Baxter had a Right Notion of *Scandal*, or giving Offence; which is the laying a Stumbling Block before others, or the being an Occasion of Sin to them. But to avoid this, we are not to disobey our Governours in things Lawful, nor to divide the Church of Christ. For,

(1.) THIS would be to abandon our own Duty to gratify the Unreasonable Scruples of other Men. It would be to do Wrong to our Superiours to whom we owe Subjection, out of Complaisance to others who are under the same Obligation. And yet to those it would be no Real Act of Charity, but rather serve to confirm them in their Ignorant Mistakes about our Ceremonies, or make them more Obstinate in Schism.

(2.) TO divide the Church lest we should give Offence, would it self be a very great Offence. *I beseech you Brethren*, says the Apostle, *mark them which cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them*, Rom. 16. 17. He puts Divisions and Offences together, because they were found together. And so they have ever been. *Schisms* are constant *Scandals*, and are to be reckon'd amongst the very worst that ever brought Reproach upon the Christian Name. They manifestly tend to the Ruine of Ecclesiastical Discipline,

pline, and the Encouragement of all manner of Vice and Wickedness. They have been the Cause that the Truth hath been Blasphem'd; that the Gospel hath been had in Derision, and that Millions of Souls have perished in their Infidelity.

Whether the next Body will be Whether the Dissenters have not aggravated their Guilt, and that

First, in leaving off Churches and Offices, opposite to those of the Church of England, or in joining with them.

Secondly, in admitting or excluding members as have no Lawful Call to the Ministry.

THE FIRST QUESTION, under the

SECT.

L 3

ers  
tion of  
is the  
ers, or  
n. But  
ey our  
divide  
on our  
sonable  
be to  
whom  
laifance  
e Obliv  
ould be  
er serve  
nt Min  
r make  
est we  
f be a  
ethren,  
cause  
he Do-  
avoid  
Divisions  
were  
e ever  
, and  
very  
upon  
nifestly  
Disci-  
pline,

## Of the Dissenters setting Churches

and the encouragement of all such  
 not of Vice and Wickedness. They have  
 been the cause that the Church hath been  
 blasphemed; that the Gospel hath been  
 had in Contention; and that Millions of  
 souls have been perished thereby.

### SECT. III.

## Of the Dissenters setting up Churches against the Conforming Churches, and of their Ordinations.

OUR next Enquiry will be, Whether  
 the Dissenters have not aggravated  
 their Guilt, and that

First, In setting up Churches and Offi-  
 cers opposite to those of the Church of  
*England*, or in joyning with them.

Secondly, In admitting or chusing such  
 Pastours as have no Lawful Call to the  
 Ministry.

### I.

THE First QUESTION under this  
 Head is,

*Whether the Dissenters have not added  
 to the Sin of Separation, by set-  
 ting up Churches and Officers op-  
 posite to those of the Church of  
 England, or in joyning with them.*

WHICH



WHICH may seem to admit of no great Dispute, for you told me in your former Letter, that, *if I proved your Separation to be Causeless, you will say as I do.* And you now promise me again to be *as good as your word.* Page 24. Page 52.

I think I have sufficiently prov'd, That you had no just Cause for deserting our Communion. And it is manifest, as I said, to all the World, that having forsaken our Churches, and revolted from our Pastors, you have form'd your selves into other Bodies, and chosen other Officers, independent on the former, and divided from them. This, by the Ancients, is called erecting Altar against Altar; and by Modern Writers a Formal Schism. It is opposite to the Welfare, and very Being of the Christian Community, and tends to the Destruction of it; as the like Practice would to the Ruine of any Society: For every Kingdom divided against it self is brought to Desolation: and every City or House divided against it self, shall not stand, Matt. 12. 25.

IN answer to this you tell me, *That if erecting Altar against Altar, be always and in it self a Formal Schism, then I must damn all the Reformed Churches that have ever been necessitated so to do, for a Company of Schismatics.* As if their Case was the same with that which I meant, and the Fathers censured under that Expression: Whereas they

Page 53.

are vastly different ; as yours is also from that of the Reformers.

Pag. 54.

YOU must tell me, you say, That *that Call that warrants and commands your coming out of Babylon, gives no Allowance of an Accommodation with it, or to come out of it by halves ; but makes it your Duty to depart from whatsoever of Babylon is yet in the Church of England.* I suppose, Sir, you are not always of that mind ; but are for paying an *Occasional Visit* now and then to *Babylon* ; and then there is as great a *Struggle* to keep you out, as, at other times, to bring you in.

Let. 1, 2.

BUT your Separate Churches, you said, are not set up in *Opposition to ours, but by a Necessity, which our Obstinate Uncharitableness hath brought you under.* And because we fear that you are labouring to establish your selves on our Ruines, you openly declare our great *Mistake of you.* And I therefore demanded, Whether there be no *Opposition* in declaring us to be *Obstinately Uncharitable* ? Is there none in tearing off Members from the Body ? Have you not forsaken us as *Unworthy of your Communion*, and charged our Publick Worship with *Defilements* ? Do not you pretend, that a *Call to come out of Babylon* obliged you to depart from us ; and does not the same *Call* reach others that you have left behind ? Would you not leave our Bishops without a People, our Pastors without a Flock ? And do not you labour to load those with *Infamy and Reproach*, that

will not joyn in the Confederacy against them? Have you not heap'd to your selves other Teachers that partake with you in the Revolt? And is it not out of our Churches, that these are continually endeavouring to draw Disciples after them? And yet we must believe, that there is nothing of Opposition in this; nothing at all against our Constitution. You forced me here to recite my own words, because you thought fit to slide by them, for no other Reason, that I know, but that you would keep your Readers in the Dark.

YOU complain'd, you know, that we would not suffer you to worship God with us, but upon such Terms as you could not submit to without Sin: And that we drove you from us by Tyrannical and Unconscionable Impositions: That you could not enjoy the Gospel Priviledges with us, nor conform any longer, but to the hazard of your Eternal All: As before in the Indictment: That the Law required you to damn your own Souls; and that we brought all this Evil upon you, and are the Causes of your Separation; and consequently of your joyning in other Congregations. But I desired you to inform me, Whether before your Separation, you were depriv'd of the Christian Priviledges of Meeting together with us in the Name of Christ, or putting up Prayers to God in our Publick Assemblies? Were you hindred from hearing the Word preach'd, and partaking with us in the Lord's Supper? When you did Communicate with us, did you thereby sin

against

against your own Souls, and hazard your Eternal All? No: You did only, as you said, discharge your Duty. Hath any New thing then been since imposed? Hath any New Law been enacted requiring you to damn your selves? Was any Force made use of to expel you from us? Or was it by Compulsion, that you have been drawing Congregations out of Congregations? Nothing of all this is pretended. Is it now become Lawful for you to Communicate with us upon Occasion; especially when it is to gain an Office in the State? No: That is by no Means to be granted. Doth an Office then furnish you with an Indulgence for the Commission of Sin? Doth it give you a License to work Wickedness? No, no: You will not own That; however it follows plainly from your words. But an Office, we may know, is of that Virtue, that it turns Idolatry into Acts of Piety, Defilements into Purity, and Pidgeons Dung into wholesome and delightful Food. It transforms *Babylon* into *Jerusalem*, and makes breaking the Commandments to be keeping of them. These are wonderful Feats, and hardly to be exceeded by the Miracles of Transubstantiation.

THIS, it seems, mov'd your Tender Bile, and to go on in your Phrase, it caus'd such an Ebulation of Gall, that I cannot but make a particular Observation on it, when you say P. 55. *Was the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance a Sound and Wholesome yea a Necessary Doctrine, with which your*

rang every where, while you had the Liberty  
 to persecute us under King Charles II. how then  
 came it to be so dangerous a Tene under King  
 James II. Was it not once damn'd as an  
Act of the highest and most unnatural Rebellion;  
for Subjects to take up Arms against their King,  
call in Foreign Aid, and to dethrone him, as  
in the Days of your Royal Martyr, how then  
came this to be sanctified into a Lawful and  
laudable Act of Loyalty? And did Confor-  
 mists say, it was an Act of Loyalty to de-  
 pose the King? Or did they call in the Fo-  
 reigners for that purpose? If so, they must  
 be under a great Disappointment, when the  
 foreigners themselves solemnly profess'd to  
 all the World, That they came to do no  
 such thing. Nor did the Lords and Com-  
 mons assembled in the Convention, who ap-  
 prov'd their Actions, pretend to any Pow-  
 er to dethrone the King, but declared that  
 the King himself had Abdicated the Go-  
 vernment. And yet have you the Confi-  
 dence to parallel their Proceedings to the  
 great Rebellion, which destroy'd the Best  
 of Princes, whom you in Derision call the  
 Royal Martyr. You may see, how you are  
 now fall'n on Persons that are in a condition  
 to defend themselves, and make you feel  
 their Resentments; but I hope they will use  
 you with Compassion, and impute it only to  
 the Perplexity you were under, and an Un-  
 thinking Inconsiderate Rashness, that you  
 made them the Subject of our Recriminati-

AS for my self, I have had no other Opinion of Government since the Revolution or at the time of it, than I had before; nor have I taught or acted any thing, but what according to the best of my Judgment, is agreeable to it. And the like, I believe may be said of the Body of the Clergy over the Nation. But such as Preach'd up Absolute Subjection to Princes, and then came with Sword in hand to bid defiance to their Doctrine, they may, if they please, make their own Apology, and plead for themselves. My Soul never entred into their Secret, and I have no Excuse at hand for them. But I suppose their number is but small, and I shall say no more of them, but that they seem to me to be Men of *Occasional Principles*, and very fit Company for your *Occasional Communicants*, with whom I leave them, and with them this Digression.

II. W



II.

WE are now to enquire,

*Whether the Pastors, which the Dissenters have chosen, have a Lawful Call to the Ministry.*

THIS, as you acknowledged, is of great Moment: And if it can be proved that they have no such Call, you granted, That it is *Let. 1. P. 33.* enough to convict both them, and the People adhering to them for Schismaticks. And if they have only Qualifications without a Rightly deriv'd Commission, you own'd that they have a further degree of Guilt upon them, and are Thieves and Robbers. I shall therefore once more examine their Pretences, that we may see whether they have not deserved those Titles.

SOME of them, as I have acknowledged, had Episcopal Ordination. But since these must have solemnly promised, That they would Obey ther Ordinary, I was desirous it should be consider'd, how the Blessing of Heaven could be expected on their Work, when it is a Continual Breach of that Engagement. To this you reply'd, *Let. 1. P. 34.* That Charity obliges you to believe, That they took the Oath of Canonical Obedience in no larger sense than is consistent with the Rules of the Gospel. But according to the Plain and Only

ly Sense of the Oath, they bound themselves to be Obedient to their Bishop in Things Lawful and Honest: And that both their taking on them this Obligation, and their breaking of it, may be justified, is, what I thought very strange; and I am apt to think, that for the Infamy of it, you may wish you had let it alone, and that you would now be content to rid your Hands of it.

I suppose it is for this purpose, that you now say, That I will tell you, that the things which they were sworn, were in themselves Lawful and Honest; and by vertue of the Episcopal Command, and much more by the Oath, were made necessary. But you believe the contrary.

S I R, your Belief is not now under Examination. But the thing in Question, from which you would wander, is, Whether the Men we are speaking of might Lawfully take this Oath of Obedience to their Bishop, by which, according to the Common and Known Interpretation of Words, they bound themselves to Ministerial Conformity; and yet might Lawfully afterwards revolt from that Obedience, reject our Ceremonies and Liturgy, and set up Congregations opposite to the Churches of the Episcopal Communion. And one would think that any Man of Sincerity should esteem these Practices Inconsistent, and Unworthy of a Christian. But you have found a Plea for them both, and would relieve you

Friend

Friend  
of the  
this  
might  
" wit  
" cou  
" wit  
they n  
Comm  
Knees  
think  
like.

I to  
much  
Presby  
have fo  
for the  
of Epil  
Separa  
munior  
the Bil  
words,  
they ne  
may pu  
Point.  
for Tri  
Men of

Sed

Epist.

Friends that need it, by a Private Meaning of their own. And as you have resolved this Case of Conscience for them, they might say with *Cydippe* \*, "We swore not with our Mind or Intention, which only could bind us; but with Words, which without it are not Obligatory: And then they might be as Innocent, as an *Occasional Communicant* is, in your Opinion, upon his Knees at the Altar. And for my part, I think you have vindicated them both alike.

I told you, That you need not now be much concern'd, if you cannot prove the Presbyterian Ordinations to be valid. You have found out a way, how your Candidates for the Ministry may obtain the Imposition of Episcopal Hands, and yet maintain their Separation. After a little *Occasional Communion*, they need but profess and swear to the Bishop, what in the Plain Sense of the words, which is Obvious to every Body, they never intend to observe, and so they may put a *Trick* upon him, and carry their Point. But this you suppose is only *Trick for Trick*. It seems then, Perjury with the Men of Scruples is playing *Tricks*; or an *Honest*

---

\* *Quæ jurat, Mors est: Nil conjuravimus illa:  
 Illa fidem Dilectis addere Sola potest. —  
 Sed si nil dedimus, præter sine Pectore Vocem.  
 Verba suis frustra viribus Orba tenes.*

Epist. Cydipp. ad Acontium. apud Ovid.

P. 34.

*Honest Outwitting* the Prelate, that would make them Swear to things that neither you nor they can *believe to be Lawful or Honest*. And here you have given us such a *Rare Specimen both of your Divinity and Charity*, in Dispensing with their Oaths, and granting them an Easy Absolution, as may recommend you to the Disciples of *Loyola*, and gain you a considerable Share in their Favour.

WE are now to consider those Teachers, who are your own in a more peculiar manner, as being Ordain'd by Presbyters. or such as are so Reputed. And their Case being New, and also disturbing the Ecclesiastical Order that was Established over the World, nothing can support it; nothing should be offer'd for its Defence, but what is clear Demonstration.

IF a Person, as I said, should now profess, That he was sent to dethrone all Kings, and to New Model all Governments, he would have no Cause to be angry, if we proposed these Questions to him, By what Authority dost thou these things? And who gave thee this Authority? And if Men will be now endeavouring to Depose or Degrade all Bishops, to Overthrow their Chairs, and Abrogate their Office; and to set up a Discipline; which was unknown to all the Churches upon Earth, they may not be offended, if we desire a sight of their Commission.

BUT

**BUT** say you, Here you do but presume and Hector, and not argue like a Scholar. And P. 73. that you may carry the Point by force of Noise, and not of Argument, you lift up the same Cry against us, as the Rabble did against Paul and Silas at Thessalonica, Acts 17. 6. Those that have turn'd the World upside down, are come hither also. You would have the World believe, that we pretend to be set over Nations and over Kingdoms, and to act what the Prophet Jeremy was but sent to foretell, to root out and to pull down, to build and to plant. How full of Bugbears hath your Jealousy fill'd your Head? Who is it that is going about to destroy you, or your Government? Is it Death to you, to let us live in Peace among you? Is it the want of your former Prey that makes you thus roar against us? Cannot you satisfy your Hunger but with our Blood, but fancy you shall be destroy'd, unless you destroy us? These are very Tragical Exclamations, but I have given you no Ground for them, nor needed you any, who could so easily be furnish'd with them out of the Vagaries of your own Brain.

**WHAT** I said of some, That they would destroy that sort of Ecclesiastical Government, which hath been transmitted to us from the Apostles, doth not suppose that they would use any External Force for that purpose. But that their Opinions and Practices naturally tend that way, and cannot succeed but upon the Ruines of the Episcopal Authority. For instance, you declare in their Name, That our Hierarchy is Antichristian:

M

tichristian:

tichristian : That our Way of Worship is Abominable, and that all ought to abandon it, as they would the Babylonish Idols. And if you could generally perswade others to be of the same mind, you would have no need of Axes or Hammers to destroy the Houses of God that are in the Land ; for the Conformists, upon their change of Principles, would by degrees desert them, and then they would be left as Desolate Places, or you might fill them with your own People. You would have no need to use Violence against the Bishops and their Clergy, for they would be forsaken every where, and their Constitution would soon be dissolved. And should your Endeavours prevail, this would be the Effect of them, tho' the Presbyterians were the Gentlest and Best Natur'd Sect in the World.

THIS is what I meant, and as much as my Words will bear : And yet this, with you, is the *Roaring for the want of my Prey* ; a plain Argument, that my *Hunger cannot be satisfied but with your Blood*. Yet, as fierce a Canibal as you make me, I can assure you, so far as my Word will do it, which as yet passes well enough with other Men, That I am as far from envying you your present Liberty, as I am from thinking that you have made a good use of it. Really it seems to me that you have lost Reputation by it, and that, as in the Fable, the warm Sun has done more towards the pulling off your Cloak, than all the Blustering of the North-Wind.

I a  
fenti  
Gene  
your  
Mind  
be up  
woul  
tent t

YC  
for de  
But th  
solution  
no Po  
have.  
swear,  
That  
Prelacy  
King do  
formity  
of Chur  
and Ca  
and Cor  
of their  
vow'd,  
a Dete  
Cause.

AN  
enough  
the mar  
with gr  
and Ar  
nal Infa  
Persons



I am also of Opinion, That your representing the Presbyterians as so Harmless a Generation, is neither for their Credit nor your own; for it only serves to call to our Minds some Transactions, which they may be unwilling to hear of, and which, if they would study to be quiet, we should be content to bury in Oblivion.

YOU say for them, That they are not for deposing Bishops, or abrogating their Office. P. 67. But this, I doubt, is only an Occasional Resolution, fit to be taken up, when they have no Power, and to be laid aside when they have. You know the time when they did swear, with Hands lifted up to Heaven, That they would endeavour to extirpate Prelacy, and to bring the Churches in the three Kingdoms to the nearest Conjunction and Uniformity in Religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church-Government, Directory for Worship, and Catechizing; and to bring to Publick Tryal and Condemn Punishment, all the Wilful Opposers of their Blessed Reformation. They likewise vow'd, That they would not give themselves to a Detestable Indifferency or Neutrality in the Cause.

AND to do them Right, they were far enough from Indifferency and Neutrality in the matter. They carried on their Work with great Rigours, and in a most Illegal and Arbitrary manner, to their own Eternal Infamy, and the Ruine of many Worthy Persons and Families. Here you see they

bound themselves by a Solemn Oath to be Persecuters, and accordingly they acted. And this, if you please, may pass for one Instance of their Moderation

WHEN their Idol of a Covenant was thrown down, they made a heavy Lamentation over it, because their Power of Persecuting for Conscience sake, did in a good measure fall with it. And being full of Anguish to see a thing ravish'd from them, on which they had set their Hearts, they lift up their Cry against *Toleration*, and said any thing of it that, they thought, might make it Odious.

*Toleration*, said one of them\*, is the Devil's Horse, on which he is mounted, to make War against the Church. And if the Devil had his Choice, said another †, whether the Hierarchy, Ceremonies and Liturgy should be established in this Kingdom, or a Toleration, he would prefer this before them all, and give up all for the sake of it. For why! It hath ever been, from first to last ‡, a Fountain of Evil, and a Root of Bitterness. It is the very thing, by which the Devil would at once lay a Foundation of his Kingdom to all Generations. O let Ministers therefore Oppose it, and Witness against it in all places. — Let us fill all Presses §§, cause

\* Vine's Serm. before the Commons, Mar. 10. 1646.

† Edwards's Full Answer, Pag. 257.

‡ Ibid. Pag. 248.

§§ Gangr. Part 1. P. 84.

all Pulpits to ring, and so possess Parliament, City, and the whole Kingdom, against the Sects, and the Evil of Schism and Toleration, that we may no more hear of Toleration, nor of Separated Churches; these being hateful Names in the Church of God.

OTHERS declar'd \*, That Toleration had done much more towards the Rooting out of Religion out of the Hearts of many Men in Seven Years, than the forcing Uniformity had in Seventy. And that it was the putting of a Cup of Poison into the Hand of a Child: Swords and Firebrands into the Hands of Mad-men: That it was the appointing a City of Refuge in Mens Consciences for the Devil to fly to; a laying of a Stumbling Block before the Blind; and a Proclaiming Liberty to the Wolves to come in to Christ's Fold to prey upon the Lambs.

Mr. Baxter † himself represented it, as the setting up a Trade for the Butchering Souls: As an Allowance to open a Shop of Poison, for all to buy and take that will: Yea, a Proclamation for this Poison in Streets and Church Assemblies; as if Mens Souls were no more worth than Rats and Mice, and other hurtful Vermin; or as if it were some Noble Atchievement, to send as many as may be to the Devil,

M 3

IT

\* Camdr. Independ. Schism, p. 14. Harmon. Consent. of the Lanc. Minist. p. 12.  
† Monit. before his Treat. of Self denial.

IT were easy to make Large Collections of this sort, but I shall mention no more at present than what was deliver'd in a Sermon before the House of Commons in these words \*, " Doth it indeed, *said the Preacher*, belong to you to look only to the Civil Peace, and to let Religion, and Truth, and the Worship of God, stand or fall, to their own Master? *Fight God, Fight Devil: Fight Christ, Fight Antichrist: Catch that Catch can.* You have nothing to do, but to stand by and look on. — Again, *Liberty of Conscience*, falsely so call'd, may in good time improve it self into Liberty of Estates, Liberty of Houses, Liberty of Wives, and in a word, Liberty of Perdition of Souls and Bodies.

YOU may see what an Opinion the Presbyterians had of Liberty of Conscience, and into what Pangs they were thrown when it prevail'd. Their Dissenting Brethren, on whom they would have no Pity, saw this very well, and upbraided them for it very smartly. *You complain*, said the Congregational Members, *of your Misery and Bondage, of Sorrows and Oppressions, and Troubles of the Church. What ails you? What troubles you? Who oppresses you? Where is there the least Shew of Oppression, or Cause of Complaint manifested; except it be, because you are not suffer'd*

---

\* See *Cafe's* Sermon to the Commons, May 26. A. D. 1647.

† *Pulp. Incend.* p. 45.

to oppress your Brethren? Can you feed upon nothing but Blood, yea the Blood of your Brethren, that though you have every thing else you complain of Sorrow and Oppression? Is this your Sorrow and Oppression that you cannot oppress? It may seem, Sir, that from hence you borrow'd the Language with which you have treated me; but you have very much misapplied it; for if I know my own Heart, I find nothing there of the Presbyterian; nothing of a Fiery Persecuting Spirit.

BUT say you, *For these Fifty Years past,* Page 74.  
*what Plots or Conspiracies have you convicted us of? As if I had made it my Business to convict you of Plots and Conspiracies! What I have to tell you is, That the Presbyterians had pretty well done their Work before the Period which you mention. For they had made an Ordinance in Parliament, in which* Ordin. Ang.  
*all Persons were prohibited to use, or cause to be used, the Book of Common-Prayer, in any Church or Publiſk Place of Worship, or in any Private Place or Family, within the Kingdom; under the Penalty of paying Five Pounds for the first Offence, for the second Ten Pounds, and for the third One whole Years Imprisonment without Bail or Mainprize.* 11. 1645.

ALL these Things these Compassionate Gentlemen thought fit to be inflicted for Obedience to the Laws of the Land.

BEFORE this they had given other Instances of their Tenderneſs and Clemency, in depoſing the Biſhops, in ſeizing on their Revenues, and expoſing their Lands to Publick Sale: As alſo in depriving many Thouſands of the Epilcopal Clergy of their Livings, and Sequeſtring them of their Goods and Rents. Dr. *Bates* † informs us, That they had a Particular Eye upon ſuch as had *Rich Benefices*, and committed ſome of them to Noiſom Priſons amongſt Thieves and Robbers, and there detain'd them for many Years: Others they confin'd under the Decks of Ships in the River *Thames*, that they might be ſmother'd by the Heat of Summer. And all this they did without hearing their Cauſe, or any Accuſation brought againſt them.

'TIS true, they ſummon'd many to take their Tryal: But as they did this by an Uſurped Power, ſo their Proceedings in it were ſuitable. Mr. *Symmons* \* acquaints us, That all Accuſations againſt any, though the beſt Miniſters, by the moſt Malicious and Lewdeſt Perſons, were invited by Ordinance, and admitted without any Proof at all.

AND

---

† Curiones præſertim Eccleſiarum, qui Optimis fruebantur Beneficiis, ædibus bonis, & redditibus, Sequeſtri nomine ſpoliantur, Ergaſtulis, Subterraneis Carceribus incluſi per Annos plures: In d' Navibus in Fluvio *Thameſi*, idq; efferveſcente jam æſtate (deportatione intentatâ) nec audirâ Cauſâ, neq; Accuſatione allata, ſqualore, jejuniis, & vigiliis macerantur. Elench, Mor. Nuper. in Anglia. p. 104.

\* Vindic. of K. Charles I. p. 73.



AND Mr. Selden, who was far enough from having any Extraordinary Kindness for them, observ'd, That in any of them, *Learning and Honesty were Sins enough.* These, Sir, are some Examples of the Tender Mercies of the Presbyterians, and they have lately been furnishing us with more in a Neighbouring Nation.

YOU know what they have done in Scotland, and yet would perswade us, That they are not for Deposing Bishops, or Overthrowing their Chairs, or Abrogating their Office. That nothing could make us imagine any such thing of them, or take them to be Men that would *turn the World upside down, but meer Jealousy that fills our Heads with Bugbears.* But you are not like thus to impose upon Mankind, or make us believe, either that your Brethren have been wanting to get what Power they could into their Hands, or that they have exercised it with Moderation.

ONE of them, as we are told †, to † Hist. Relat. of the Gener. Assemb. at Edinburgh, A. D. 1690. comply with the Designs then on foot, did in his Prayers put up some Petitions for Moderation; but as if he were afraid that God would take him at his word, he added, *But O Lord to be Free, it would be better to make a Clean House.* This Man's Instruction to his Maker, shews what Spirit he was of; even the same that Reigns in the Leaders of the sect, who are for demanding Liberty every where, and granting it no where.

THEY

THEY have of late renew'd their *Covenant* in several places, and one Article of it being for the Destruction of Episcopacy there is no doubt, but they will push it on as far as they are able. There is no doubt but they are of the Temper of their Predecessors, who not content to Exercise their Discipline at home with great Inhumanity would extend it to other Nations: Because as they said \*, *they could not long, like Goshen enjoy their Light, if Darknes should cover the Face of other Reformed Kirks: that Judah could not long continue in Liberty, if Israel were lead into Captivity: And therefore the Condition of the one Kirk and Kingdom, whether in Religion or Peace, must be common to both.* And what that Condition of the Kirk was, and what they meant by this Cant I need not Explain.

Article 2.

IT agrees with their Solemn League, by which they had bound themselves to act in such a manner, as *that the Lord might be One and his Name One in the Three Kingdoms* That is, that they might force all into Conformity with themselves. And at the same time they made it their Prayer to Almighty God, that he would Bless them with such Success as might be *Encourage*

---

\* See the Earl of Clarendon's History of the Rebellion Part. 2. B. 7. Pag. 341.

ment † to other Christian Churches, groaning under, or in danger of the Yoke of Antichristian Tyranny, to joyn in the same or like Association. That is, amongst other things, they would have those Churches to combine together, after their Example, for the Deposing of Bishops, and for Establishing the Presbyterian Government; and this with them is the *Enlargement of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ*.

Ibid.

I make no question, but there are many Peaceable Dissenters in *England*, that are content to enjoy their Liberty; and are in greater ease under our Present Constitution, than they could hope to be, if your *True Presbyterians*, your **HIGH KIRKMEN**, were at the Helm. For the Business of these must be, what it ever was, when they were not under Restraint, to carry on their Work, and exercise their Discipline with great Rigour, and without any respect of Persons, or regard to tender Consciences. They Vow'd the Destruction of *Heresy and Schism*, and having made themselves Judges of both, they might call what they pleas'd by those Names. And the Truth is, they have so order'd matters, that what they have advanced, as the *Scepter of Christ*, may, in my Opinion, be more fitly compar'd to the *Scorpions of Rehoboam*.

YOU

---

† See the Conclusion of the Covenant.

YOU may now see what you have gotten by your Excursions; in which I was willing to pursue you the farther, because you have offer'd so little in the way out of which I was drawn, that deserves any notice. However, I return to it; and now the Question before us is, Whether your Teachers, who were Ordain'd by Presbyters or such as were so Reputed, have a good Title to the Ministry.

YOU affirm it, and to prove it, you say, p. 88. *that for Presbyters to Ordain Presbyters, is as Natural and Proper as for Men to beget Men; or any other Species of Creatures to beget their Like.* But then it seems to me, that all the Sons of Presbyters must be Presbyters, as all the Sons of the Aaronical Priests were Priests; or rather as all the Sons of Men are Men, and as the Off-spring of Beasts and Birds are of the same Kind with themselves.

SO it must be! Otherwise, you say, I make the Presbyters but as a Kind of Poor Mushroom, or some Anomalous Plant, that hath not Seed in it self to propagate or preserve its own Kind. A sad Case indeed! to shrink him below the Rank of Brutes. But do you think that Deacons are no better than Poor Mushrooms, because they do not Ordain Deacons? Or that Civil and Military Officers are Anomalous Plants, if they cannot confer the same Honours, which they Enjoy by the favour of the Crown?

This

This is Ridiculous: But I will confess to you freely, that, if you insist upon this Assertion, *that for Presbyters to beget Presbyters, is as Natural as for Men to beget Men, or for other Species of Creatures to beget their like*, you will put me to a loss; because, after some thought spent upon it, I can find nothing more Absurd, with which I might confute and expose it, than is the Proposition it self.

I suppose, it will be granted by others, that Offices in the Christian Church are not of Nature, nor are they propagated, as Men beget Men, or Beasts beget Beasts: But wholly depend upon the Institution of Christ himself. Now this we know, that as the Father sent him, *Joh. 20. 21.* so he sent his Apostles. As the Father gave him Power to Constitute them, so he gave them Power to Appoint other Officers, for his Service and for the Benefit and Edification of his Church, as there should be occasion. And this Power was not limited to their Persons; for if so, there had soon been an end of the Ministry; but it descended upon their Successors, who were the Bishops. But that the same Authority was committed to meer Presbyters, doth not appear from Scripture, nor from the Writings of the Fathers, but is against the Universal Tradition of the Church, as every Body knows that hath made any strict Enquiry into these matters.

I have taken it for granted, that the Government of the Churches in the first Age, when the Administration of it was in the hands of the Apostles, and their Fellow-labourers was Prelatical, and that the Bishops were Successors to the Apostles, and vested with the same Authority, which They receiv'd from Christ: as also that after the Apostles days, there was no space of time as some have imagin'd, nor any Country in the World where Christianity prevail'd, without Episcopacy; and consequently that the way both of the Presbyterians and Independents is New, and was unknown to Antiquity. These things, I say, I have taken for granted, because I had prov'd them in another Treatise \*; yet my asserting them again you call *a high Rant of Words, than which nothing, you say, can be more untrue.* You tell me, that *I Presume and Hector;* and *you submit it to the Censure of Impartial Judges; how like a Rabbi, or Ecclesiastical Hero, I have defended my Province.* And I doubt not, but such Judges will determine, that a little Modesty would have requir'd you to attempt the answering the Arguments with which I confirm'd the Propositions, which you reject with so much Disdain, before you us'd such Language; but you choose a far easier way, which was to pass by them without any notice, and fall to your Trade of Scoffing and calling Names.

Treat. of Ch. Government.  
Painted A.D. 1692.  
Page 72.  
p. 73.  
p. 106.

YOU



YOU had before compar'd me to the Witch of Endor, and bestow'd on me the Title of a *Tamny*, and to excuse it, you now say, you found me one to whom it did agree, p. 177. And you said so much more in this Style, that if the Controversy between us be to be managed on the side of the Dissenters, with Ill manners and the very Dregs of Railing and Scurrility, I will confess, that I think you the Person of the World that is fittest to be chosen the Champion of the Party. But as to the Reasoning Part, either against Episcopacy, or for Presbyterian Ordinations, I think it hath been managed with more strength by others: And if I see any Occasion, to add any thing to what I have already publish'd on either Subject, I shall rather chuse to examine what has been said by the most Learned Adversaries, than any longer to attend the motions of one, who hath only made their Objections his own, by an Ill Repetition of them, or by Disguising them under the *Mire and Dirt of his Expressions*.

ONLY to shew, that it is not without a Cause that I treat this Part of your Work with something of Contempt, I shall give some account of what hath pass'd between us concerning these words of S. Paul to Timothy, *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee by the laying on of hands of the Presbytery*, 1 Tim. 4. 14. This is the Principal Place that hath been urged by the Presbyterians, and on it the whole Fabrick of their Discipline and

and Government must rest, or upon nothing. And it might well be expected that here you should lay out your Strength. I shall therefore recite a few of the things that I said on this Subject, and then consider your Answers to them, and so put an end to this Section.

**PRESBYTERY**, as I shew'd you, is a Word of a Doubtful Signification, and may be either taken for an Office, or for the Persons that bear it. And supposing it here to be understood of Persons, we are not certain from the Expression it self, who are intended by it. For as a Name of Dignity, it is not always taken in the same limited Sense, but sometimes attributed to Ecclesiastical Officers of the highest Rank. St. John twice calls himself a *Presbyter* in his Epistles. And St. Peter assumes the same Title where he says, *the Elders which are among you I Exhort, who am also an Elder*. And now the Question is, Whether the Supreme or Inferior Presbyters Ordain'd Timothy: That is, whether they did it who had Power to Ordain him; or they, who, as far as we can find, had no such Authority.

**THESE** were my Words, and in them are imply'd these Two things, The one is that the Supreme Presbyters had the Power of Ordination; The Second, that the Inferior had it not committed to them, and both these Propositions may deserve our farther thoughts.

1 John 2.  
3. 1.  
1 Pet. 5. 1.

1. THE

1. THE Supreme Presbyters had the power of Ordination committed to them, and that by Jesus Christ, who said to them, *As my Father sent me, even so send I you,* Joh. 10. 21. This I noted before, and being a thing past all doubt, I need not farther enlarge upon it.

WHAT displeases you is, that I should talk of a *Supreme and an Inferior Order of Presbyters*, which, you say P. 88, is *but my Dream and Unprov'd Hypothesis*. But I had prov'd, that the Title of Presbyters is, in Scripture, ascrib'd to the Apostles, as well as to their Subordinate Officers. And I think it plain enough from hence, that the Persons bearing that Title were of different Ranks.

YOU said in your former Letter, P. 42, *That the Apostles did not Ordain as Apostles, but as Presbyters, which Title they own in their Epistles, and claim as their Honour*. Well, when they had a Right to it; for we may be sure they would not be Usurpers of it. But where did you learn, that the Apostles Ordain'd as Presbyters, and not as Apostles? Not in the Scripture I am sure, where there is no such thing; nor have you any Authority for it. But only because they are call'd Presbyters, you would have them act as such, and not otherwise, when it may serve your Turn. But as I said, you might with

N

more

more Shew of Reason have told me, that Aaron acted only as an Ordinary Priest, because he is never stiled High Priest in the Books of Moses. Such Reasoning signifies nothing but the want of better Arguments.

Ibid.

- YET, because you would say some thing to confirm it, you added, *That it is the Presbyter, and not the Bishop (considered only as such) that must Ordain, is put beyond Controversy in a Right Case, that a Bishop or Prelate Ordains per Saltum, (i. e. who never had the Ordination of a Presbyter himself, but (as of a Bishop) can neither Consecrate, nor Administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Body, nor Ordain a Presbyter. It seems he was something Viler than the Mushroom, or the Anomalous Plant.*

- BUT I demanded, Where the *Ca* is *Red*, or in what Record of Antiquity it is to be found? In none that I know of. But that's no matter, the People for whom you design'd your Learned Labours, are not like to trouble their Heads about it, or suspect that you would impose on them Forgeries for *Red Cases*.

- HAVING said this in my Vindication, I doubted not but, if the *Red Case* was to be had, it would be produced with Triumph. But it was

when

where to be found: Nor do you pretend, That there was any Law, or Written Record, wherein it was preserved for the Instruction of Posterity. But you conceive, That Common Practice and Custom, founded on the Nature of the thing, are sufficient for that purpose.

Pag. 89.

AND now, there is no doubt but your Credulous Readers may be easily persuaded, That you have somewhere discover'd the Practice which, you say, is so Common; somewhere found the Custom which you mention; and that otherwise, you would not have had the Confidence, after the Reproof I had given you, to write of it, as a Thing past all Question.

BUT you must pardon me, that after the Experience I have had of you, I cannot depend upon your Word without better Evidence. I am apt to think, you are as much in the dark about this Common Practice, or Custom, as you were about the *Ruled Case*; I more than suspect, That it is all your own Invention, and that you have been at your usual pains, to *Suffult* one Forgery by a Lett. r. other.

BUT say you, Will not the Common Practice, Doctrine, and Rubrick of your Church, amount to the Force of a Rule in this Case? Yes, Sir, they would, if

you could produce them for what you contend. But we have no such Practice, no such Doctrine or Rubrick. *We have no such Custom, nor the Churches of God.*

TO deal freely with you, I think it was a little Imprudent to appeal to the Practice, Doctrine and Rubrick of the Church of *England*, which every Body may consult. As long as you laid the Scene of your Impositions abroad, and had the help of some false Lights, you might hope to succeed the better; but here all is clear Day, and every One that will open his Eyes, may see the Tricks you play, to your own Confusion.

THE Result of all is this: Finding your self under some Difficulties, you appeal'd to a certain *Ruled Case*, supposing, perhaps, that none would question what you affirm'd with Assurance. But the *Ruled Case* was not to be found in any *Record*, and now you have appeal'd to *Common Custom*. But that *Custom* is not to be found abroad; and you have farther appeal'd to the *Practice, Doctrine and Rubrick* of the Church of *England*. But there is no such Practice, no such Doctrine or Rubrick, as may be for your purpose. And therefore this whole Matter may rest upon your Hands, it being intirely your own Fiction; but very ill contriv'd and without any Shadow of Probability.



H A D you not better acknowledge your Mistakes, than thus to heap one Error upon another? P. 34. *How long shall we bear such vain Words? When will you be ashamed of your Refuge of Lies, where you take Sanctuary, to the Reproach of the Christian Religion?*

2. T H E Inferior Presbyters had not, that we can find, the Power of Ordination, committed to them. If you have found it otherwise, you should have imparted to us your Discovery. It is a Thing of such Moment, and your Cause does so much depend upon it, that you should have produced some clear Evidence for it from the Holy Scripture.

B U T, say you P. 89, *If you expect Express Words of the Holy Scripture for it, you may as well call it an Impious Presumption to Baptize Infants, and to keep the First and not the Seventh Day of the Week, for the Christian Sabbath.* To which I reply, that neither did I insist upon your producing *Express Words of Scripture*: Nor are the Cases, you object, Parallel to what you are to prove: But to shew their Disparity would require too large a Digression.

N 3

WHAT

WHAT I affirm is, That neither can it be gather'd from Express Words of Scripture, nor by any Just Inference drawn from thence, that the Power of Ordination was committed to meer Presbyters. Nor yet does it appear from Credible Testimony, that there is so much as One Approved Instance of their Exercise of that Authority, within a Thousand Years after the Days of the Apostles. And if you will say as much against Infant Baptism, and the Observation of the Lord's Day, you would very much gratify the *Anabaptists*, and the *Judeizers*, and the Profane; but that no Body would regard Sayings so Notoriously False, that they could do no Service to any Party.

YET for the Validity of Presbyterian Ordinations, you argue from the *Primitive Identity*, which you suppose, P. 95. *There was of the Bishop and Presbyter. In the Primitive State of the Church, you say, the Bishop and Presbyter were one and the same Office, without any Note of Distinction of Superiority or Inferiority between them.* But all the Ground that I have seen for this Assertion is, that the Title of Bishops is in Scripture communicated to Presbyters. And this I have granted; but at the same time I have prov'd \*, that such Bishops were Subordin-

ate

---

\* Treat. of Ch. Government, C. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

ate to other Bishops or Superior Pastors. And if so, the whole Dispute is about Words, and in Reality the Government of the Church was, as I have asserted, Episcopal from the Beginning.

THAT it was so in the very next Ages after the Apostles, I have demonstrated † from a Cloud of Witnesses that flourished in those times. And their Testimony cannot be over-ballanc'd by a few Passionate but Mistaken Expressions of S. Jerom, or a False Quotation from him: Not by the Fictions of *Philostorgius* or *Eutychius*, nor the Idle Stories of *Hector Boethius* and *Fordon*: Not by the Sayings of Presbyterians, nor indeed of any Conformists that are against the Sense of their own Church and the Universal Tradition: Not by Legends and Romances, nor by *Feigned Customs and Ruled Cases*: Nor by any thing else that ever hath been, or that ever can be, produced against it. But I have said enough on this Subject, in the Treatise to which I have so often refer'd you, that I need not any longer detain you with it.

I shall only add, That the Fathers who appear'd most in the Favour of the Presbyters, or ascrib'd most Power to them, did always except Ordination. So did St. Chrysostom: So did St. Jerom: So did the most

N 4

Eminent

---

† Ibid. C, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18.

Eminent of the Greeks and Latins after their Example. And I know nothing in which the Churches over the World were more Unanimous, 'till the Popes endeavoured to bring down the Bishops to the Level of Priests, and thereby to promote and secure their own Usurpations.

Book  
as you  
multi  
dred  
Purpo  
swer

I th  
have  
page,  
whose  
the ter  
than 2  
or M  
this  
shew,  
expe

their  
which  
more  
ed to  
el of  
ecure

# Conclusion.

**W**HEN I entred upon this Work, I intended nicely to Examine your Book from the Beginning to the End. But as you had made it too Tedious by a great multitude of Digressions; so you had rendered it Unnecessary by saying nothing to the Purpose, but what may receive an easy Answer from what I have Publish'd.

I think, the most Pertinent Thing you have offer'd is the Quotation in your Title-page, which describes to us a sort of Men, whose Brains, like the Unicorn's, run out into the length of their Horn; who have more Fury than Zeal, and yet more Zeal than Knowledge or Moderation. And you very fitly placed this in your Frontispiece, where it may shew, what sort of Performances were to be expected from you.

YOU

Pref. p. 1.

YOU have taken care to inform your Reader, that you made Quick Dispatch in answering my Discourse of Schism. And it may be so, for ought I know; and I would not dispute with you about that Matter. But you had a better way of proving this than by your own Word: For you might have appeal'd to the many Marks of haste, which you left upon your Work.

Pref. p. 4.

As for my self, I confess your Reflections on my Slowness would be just, but that you have represented it much greater than it was. You may bid Defiance to me, if you please, in these Words of *Crispinus*\*, *Here take Paper, and let Time, and Place, and Guards be assign'd; and let us see, which of us can write Most.* And I should no more accept of that Challenge than *Horace*, who relates it, would. Mr. *Dacier* in his Commentary on *Horace*, produces Examples of several Persons who were of the humour of *Crispinus*: but concludes with this Remark, *There is nothing, says he, of which Ignorant Men make so great account, as this unhappy Facility of Scribling.* And of such

\*Accipe jam tabulas. Detur nobis locus, hora:

Custodes: videamus uter plus scribere possit.

Horat. Sat. 4. Lib 1. v. 15. 16.

‡ Car. il n'y a rien dont les Ignorans fassent tant de cas que de cette malheureuse facilité. *Dacier* in loc. p. 316.



we may say, that they have a great Opinion of themselves, but a mean one of their Readers.

I have not said this, to have you reckon'd amongst the Ignorant, or to disparage your Natural or Acquir'd Abilities. For these, I grant, are sufficient to have made you manage your Cause better, when you would give your self leave to think you have said as much as it would bear, and wrangled as Notably as Any of your way. But yet by an Inconsiderate Rashness, and for want of due Care in getting Information, you have asserted several things with great Confidence, which none but the Ignorant would have said. Of this number, is your *Rul'd* Page 83. Case; and your Saying, which I so lately mention'd, that for Presbyters to Ordain Presbyters, is as Natural and Proper, as for Men to beget Men: or any other Species of Creatures to beget their like. You have many things of this sort, but I need not here repeat them.

YOUR great Business was to throw Dirt, and you have done it very liberally; but so untowardly, that a great deal of it fell upon the Heads of your Friends. You mingled it in your Apologies as well as Invectives; and I am apt to think that many Dissenters will be as much asham'd of the one, as Conformists despise the other.

I can hardly doubt, but there are many Dissenters in the Kingdom, that disdain the

the Plea you have made for them. For you have represented them as Kneeling before an Idol, and breathing out Smoak and Abominations against Heaven: As feeding on an Ass's head, and a Dead Carcass: As eating Dung and Filthy Excrements; and declaring, that all this is *Sweet to their Hungry Souls*, and all this they can do to get into a *Publick Post*. This is the Figure which you have given them, and they will not find that they have any better, when they view themselves in the *Glass of your Argumentations*,

SINCE you have us'd your Brethren in such a manner, we need less regard the Reproaches which you would cast upon the Bishops and the Conforming Clergy. And I can affirm, that if you have no better Success in your General Charge against them, than you have in some Particular Accusations; it must return upon you with Infamy, and leave you cover'd with your own *Defilements*.

Page 116.

YOU say, *One of my Coat told a Gentlewoman lately, that to play the Whore was not so great a Sin as to go to a Conventicle*. But I that knew him very well, can tell you, that he had such an account of the Woman, you speak of, from her Neighbours, as would not suffer him to trust himself alone in her Company, nor discourse with her without a Witness. He therefore took with him an Intelligent Friend of known Reputation,

who

who  
Fals  
mu  
of  
in  
on.

hav  
the  
Viol  
enco

God

fels,

was

man

had

man

that

this

But

cern

for

shou

my

of

Clou

Y

you

And

stice

†H

*The Conclusion.*

139

who is ready to testify that your Report is False. And finding that it has receiv'd much Improvement in your Relation of it, I have Reason to think that it is, in some measure, of your own Invention.

ANOTHER Story, with which you have furnish'd your self, is, that *I could in the heat of my Zeal animate some of the most Violent Executioners of Wrath against you, and encourage them to the Spoil, by telling them that God would bless them the better.* And I confess, I have heard that something like this was whisper'd abroad, and that the Gentleman was nam'd, who had declar'd that I had express'd my self to him in some such manner. But he denies, as he had reason, that I spake any such Words to him; and this he offer'd to certify under his hand, But I think the World is not so much concern'd in my Character, nor does the Cause for which I am concern'd need, that I should turn out of my way, to vindicate my self against every Lying Accusation, of I know not what Witnesses in the Clouds.

YOU pretend, that for what you say, you have the *Testimony of my Neighbour*†. And if so, it had been but a piece of Justice to let me know, who they are, that I might

---

† If the Testimony of your Neighbours be true &c. idid.

might have made Enquiry into the matter, and done my self Right. But that was far from your design. The Pestilence, which you would scatter, must walk in Darkness, or it would lose its Effect, and defeat your Expectation.

Dr. O. of  
Schism. p. 11. 12

BUT as Dr. Owen says, "Is there any thing more undbecoming a Man, laying aside all Considerations of Christianity, than to suffer his Judgment to be Tainted, much more his Words and Publick Expressions in charging and accusing others, to be Regulated by Report. And whereas we are commanded to *Speak Evil of no Man*, may we not on this ground *Speak Evil of all Men*, and justify ourselves by saying, *if Reports be true*? The Prophet tells us, that a Combination for his Defaming was managed among his Adversaries, *Jerem. 20. 10. I have heard the Defaming of many, Fear on every side: Report, said they, and we will Report it. If they can have any to go before them in the Transgression of the Law (which He that knows how the Tongues of Men are set on Fire of Hell, gave out to lay a Restraint upon them, Thou shalt not raise a false Report, Exod. 23. 1.) they will second it, and and spread it abroad, for his disadvantage and trouble.*

Cure of Ch.  
Divisions. p.  
128.

TO the same purpose Mr. Baxter says, "You think it is a fair Excuse, when you either believe or report Evil of another,

to

to say, that you stand id from very Ho-  
nest and Religious Persons, or you heard  
it from many, and confidently utter'd  
" But God hath not allow'd you to believe  
" Backbiters, because they are Godly, or  
" because they are many. To this every Age  
" and Time doth experimentally confute  
" this Excuse! In which it is so common a  
" thing, for False Reports and News to be  
" utter'd with confidence, and that by Mul-  
" titudes, and many of them Religious,  
" and yet neither Truth nor Ground at all  
" for what is said.

INDEED Godly Backbiters and Religious  
Slandermers appear to us a strange sort of  
Creatures. But Mr. Baxter, it seems, found  
many of them, and he admonish'd them ve-  
ry honestly, that Backbiters and *Heaven* of  
God are conjoyn'd, Rom. 1. 30. And that  
" He that Backbiteth his Neighbour, Inor-  
" der to Evil to his Neighbour, not content upon  
" Reproach against his Neighbour, is One  
" that hath the Mark of a Citizen of Zion,  
" Psa. 15. 3.

It may be, says our Author farther, Ibid p. 129.  
the Report which you hear may be all  
" False: Or it may be, it is some little  
" Matter made much greater than it is: Or  
" it may be some part of the Truth is con-  
" ceal'd, and some Circumstances which  
" would make it better understood. How-  
" ever, if it be true, when the Reporter  
" hath no Call to speak it, or when the Ac-  
" cused



"Cus'd is not heard to speak for himself,  
 "and you never heard what he hath to say,  
 "there is Sin and Injustice in the Backbiter;  
 "the Beliver and Reporter

THUS Sir for your Railing I have re-  
 turn'd you good Counsel, taken from your  
 own Authors, that it might have the better  
 Influence upon you, and be the more for  
 your Edification. And I have been so far  
 from picking up Stories, with which I might  
 oppose your Stories, that I have refus'd  
 some that were offer'd; and resolv'd not at  
 all to meddle with you any farther than you  
 had discover'd your self in your Books.  
 But if you go on in this way, I know not  
 whether you may not find a Scourge in  
 a Severer hand, that will not spare you, as  
 I have done.

I F Men will be pouring out upon the In-  
 nocent the Poison of Asps, and the Venom  
 of Vipers, some may think it proper to  
 prescribe other Antidotes against them than  
 I have us'd. And if they will be speaking  
 Evil against us falsely, and at their Pleasure,  
 they may happen to hear Unpleasing Truths,  
 that may make them uneasy and create them  
 Vexation enough.

*Dabine ne quiescant, porro manes; & desinant  
 Maledicere, Malefacta ne noscant sua.*

BUT



BUT my Concern is with your self, and intending still to treat you in another manner, and not as you deserve, I would give you the Best and most Charitable Advice I can : And if you will but attend to it, I hope it may for the Future Check the *Ebullitions of your Gall*, and do something towards the Cure of the *Rancour of your Spleen*; which hath put you upon saying things, that to my knowledge, have created a great deal of Laughter in Some, who are not so dispos'd to pity you, as I am : and which doubtless hath given you no small Disturbance.

TO search into the Bottom of your Distemper, and to propose to you the best Remedy I can, I observe, that one thing which stirr'd your Choler very much, was, what I told you, that the Act of Indulgence was only design'd to give Liberty to tender Consciences; and not to those who were satisfied with their Conformity, and did not joyn in our Communion with Doubts and Scruples upon them. And at this you take Fire, and break out into these Exclamations.

*Oh how do your Fingers itch to be at your Old Persecuting Work again with us? How fain would you cut us off from the Protection of the Laws? A heavy Charge! But it falls on the Commons Assembled in Parliament, in whose Sentiments I am in this mat-*

Let. 1. p. 72.

Let. 2. p. 134.

ter, as appears from the Papers † Printed by their Order. So that you do in effect tell the Representatives of the Nation, that *Their Fingers inch to be at the Persecuting Work, and thus they would gain cut you off from the Protection of the Laws.* And now you may sit down and consider, how bold a Stroke this is, and what hazards you may run, if you will be guided by your Passion, and shoot out your Arrows at adventure.

THIS I have written to make you more Cautious; and if it be possible, to bring you to your Right Mind. For which purpose, I would offer one thing more to you, that may deserve your Serious Thoughts, and make Impressions on you to your Advantage.

I suppose you may have seen, or at least heard, of a Pamphlet Intitl'd, *Short Work with the Dissenters*: And I would have you take notice, that what the Author of it intended, was to suggest, that what the Conformists, who have a Zeal for their Constitution, as all that are Conscientious have, are for Extirpating the Separatists; for hanging them up, or sending them to the Gallies. This is much in your Style, and 'tis manifest, that you had both the same Design.

---

† Toleration was intended only for the Ease of tender and scrupulous Consciences, &c, p. 24.

**The Conclusion.**

195

Design. But you managed it in a different manner; you more Openly and Bluntly, and he with more Art and Cunning. And yet you may do well to remember, what may be of great use to you, that the Witty Man hath since sung a *Hymn to the Pillory*. A Word to the Wife is sufficient.

I am,

SIR,

Your Humble Servant,

R. B.

The Complaint

T

Teller. But you managed it in a different  
 manner; for more Openly and Bluntly  
 and he with more Art and Cunning. And  
 yet you may do well to remember, what  
 may be of great use to you, that the World  
 will be full of such a kind of people in the future.  
 A Word to the Wise is sufficient.

---

## ERRATA.

**P**AGE 8. Line ult. r. *Breach*; P. 14 l.  
 1. after *Sir* add *if*; P. 29 l. 13. r. *things*;  
 P. 36. l. 32. r. *Decree*; P. 38. l. 28. r. *Prose-*  
*lytes*; P. 46. Marg. l. 1. r. *offendit*, l. 2. r. *penes*.  
 P. 57. l. 7. r. *Salmasius*; P. 96. l. 8. for *Liberty*  
 r. *Property*; P. 104. l. 17. r. *one another*; P.  
 142. l. 10. for *now* r. *more*; P. 154. l. 11. r.  
*Unlawful*, l. 32. r. *Ebullition*.

29 MR 59

---

Doc  
num  
bns  
rev  
1001  
1000  
1000  
1000

4 L  
ings;  
Profe-  
oenes.  
berty  
r; P.  
I. I.